

IOWA PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF
IMPORTANCE AND EXPERTISE REQUIRED TO MANAGE
IDENTIFIED TASKS

An abstract of a Dissertation by
Aubury L. Adair
July 1981
Drake University
Advisor: Charles D. Rowley

The Problem. This study was conducted to examine Iowa secondary school principals' perceptions of administrative tasks as to the importance of the task and the expertise needed to manage the task.

Procedure. A questionnaire was sent to randomly selected Iowa secondary school principals to obtain their perceptions. The data was placed in groups based on enrollment of the school and the number of years as an administrator. A two-factor analysis of variance was used to test for significance. When significance was found a multiple range test was employed.

Findings. Importance was significant among principals of differing years of experience in the following tasks: students' rights, informing the superintendent, and plant management. Expertise was significant among the principals in the task of plant management.

Importance was significant among principals of schools of differing enrollment in the following tasks: delegation of responsibility, faculty meetings, plant management, and distribution of funds. Expertise was significant among the principals in the following tasks: evaluation, faculty meetings, and distribution of funds.

Conclusions. While some differences were found to exist, the results of the study did not conclusively support the research hypotheses. The following conclusions can be drawn from this study: (1) differences in experience as secondary school principals had no major effect on perceptions of importance or expertise required to manage specific administrative tasks. (2) Secondary school enrollment had no major effect on secondary school principals' perceptions of importance or expertise required to manage specific administrative tasks.

Recommendations. Agencies and institutions responsible for conducting secondary school principal training programs or inservice programs should not consider years of experience as a principal or the enrollment of the school the principals administer as factors in the development of training programs. Agencies and institutions engaged in training or inservice programs for principals should examine their programs in regard to the tasks that principals perceived as being most important and requiring the most expertise.

IOWA PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS
OF IMPORTANCE AND EXPERTISE REQUIRED TO MANAGE
IDENTIFIED TASKS

A Dissertation
Presented to
The School of Graduate Studies
Drake University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Aubury L. Adair
July 1981

IOWA PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS
OF IMPORTANCE AND EXPERTISE REQUIRED TO MANAGE
IDENTIFIED TASKS

by

Aubury L. Adair

Approved by Committee:

Charles D. Rowley
Chairperson

Richard W. Lampshire
Sam M. Sanders

Eale I. Canfield
Dean of the School of Graduate Studies

CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
1. BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Rationale	5
Purpose of the Study	5
Significance of the Study	6
Hypotheses	6
Definitions	7
Assumptions	8
Limitations	8
Organization of the Study	8
2. RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE	9
Overview	9
Part I: The Development of American Education and of the Secondary School Principalship Prior to 1950	12
Part II: Important Factors that have Influenced and Changed the Public Schools and the Tasks of the Secondary Principal from the 1950's to the Present Time (1980)	21
Changing Expectations of Society	24
Student Activism	30
Teacher Activism	33
The Courts and the Schools	39

Chapter	Page
3. METHODOLOGY	45
Design of Study	45
Instrument	45
Validation	48
Population and Sample	49
Data Collection and Organization	50
Analysis of Data	51
Statistical Treatment	53
4. ANALYSIS OF DATA	55
5. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	113
Procedures	113
Findings	114
Conclusions	119
Recommendations	120
BIBLIOGRAPHY	124
APPENDICES	
A. PROPOSED QUESTIONNAIRE	129
B. LETTER ACCOMPANYING PROPOSED QUESTIONNAIRE	132
C. WORKSHEET ACCOMPANYING PROPOSED QUESTIONNAIRE	133
D. COVER LETTER	134
E. DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF QUESTIONNAIRE	135

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Three Enrollment Categories and the Number of Principals in each Category who Returned the Questionnaire	56
2. Three Categories of Years of Experience as a Secondary Principal and the Number of Principals that are Represented by each Category	56
3. Importance of Student Scheduling by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	58
4. Importance of Supervision of Federal Programs by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	59
5. Importance of Time Management by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	60
6. Importance of Supervision of Co-Curricular and Extra-Curricular Activities of Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	60
7. Importance of Planning for Co-Curricular and Extra-Curricular Activities by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	61
8. Importance of Handling of Grievances by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	62
9. Importance of Delegation of Responsibility to Staff by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	62
10. Importance of Delegation of Responsibility to Staff by Secondary School Enrollment Categories using a Multiple Range Test:Least Square Difference Procedure	63

Table

Page

11.	Importance of Supervision of Special Education Programs by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	64
12.	Importance of Formal Evaluation of Personnel by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals . . .	64
13.	Importance of Standardized Test Interpretation by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	65
14.	Importance of Management of Non-Certified Personnel by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	66
15.	Importance of Student Control and Maintenance of Discipline by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	66
16.	Importance of Conducting Educational Research by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals . . .	67
17.	Importance of Conducting Educational Research by Secondary School Enrollment Categories using a Multiple Range Test:Least Square Difference Procedure	68
18.	Importance of Curriculum Development by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	68
19.	Importance of Knowledge of Students' Rights by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	69
20.	Importance of Knowledge of Students' Rights by Years of Experience as a Principal using a Multiple Range Test:Least Square Difference Procedure	69
21.	Importance of Developing and Implementing Teacher Inservice Programs by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	70

Table

Page

22.	Importance of Working Knowledge of Legal Aspects of Education by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	71
23.	Importance of Long-Range Planning of Programs by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	71
24.	Importance of Public Relations by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	72
25.	Importance of Maintaining Good Staff Morale by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	73
26.	Importance of Planning and Conducting Faculty Meetings by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	73
27.	Importance of Planning and Conducting Faculty Meetings by Secondary School Enrollment Categories using a Multiple Range Test:Least Square Difference Procedure	74
28.	Importance of Orientation of New Staff Members by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	75
29.	Importance of Promotion of Professional Growth of Teachers by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	75
30.	Importance of Maintaining Effective Communications with Students by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	76
31.	Importance of Keeping the Superintendent Informed by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	77
32.	Importance of Keeping the Superintendent Informed by Experience Categories using a Multiple Range Test:Least Square Difference Procedure	77

Table

Page

33.	Importance of Input into Teacher Selection and Assignment by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	78
34.	Importance of Representing the School in Associations by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	79
35.	Importance of Working with Advisory Committees by Secondary School Enrollment and Experi- ence of Iowa Secondary School Principals . . .	79
36.	Importance of Plant Management by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	80
37.	Importance of Plant Management by Experience Categories using a Multiple Range Test: Least Square Difference Procedure	80
38.	Importance of Plant Management by Secondary School Enrollment Categories using a Multiple Range Test:Least Square Difference Procedure	81
39.	Importance of Distribution of Allocated Funds by Secondary School Enrollment and Experi- ence of Iowa Secondary School Principals . . .	82
40.	Importance of the Distribution of Allocated Funds by Secondary Enrollment Categories using a Multiple Range Test:Least Square Difference Procedure	82
41.	Importance of the Development of Building Policies for Students and Staff by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	83
42.	Expertise Required to Manage Student Scheduling by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	84
43.	Expertise Required to Manage the Supervision of Federal Programs by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	85

Table

Page

44.	Expertise Required for the Management of Time Management by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	85
45.	Expertise Required for the Management of Supervision of Co-Curricular and Extra-Curricular Activities by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	86
46.	Expertise Required for the Management of Planning for Co-Curricular and Extra-Curricular Activities by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	87
47.	Expertise Required for the Management of the Handling of Grievances by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	87
48.	Expertise Required for the Delegation of Responsibility to Staff by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	88
49.	Expertise Required for the Supervision of Special Education Programs by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	89
50.	Expertise Required for the Formal Evaluation of Personnel by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	89
51.	Expertise Required for the Formal Evaluation of Personnel by Secondary School Enrollment Categories using a Multiple Range Test:Least Square Difference Procedure	90
52.	Expertise Required for Standardized Test Interpretation by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	91
53.	Expertise Required for the Management of Non-Certified Personnel by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	91

Table

Page

54.	Expertise Required for Student Control and Maintenance of Discipline by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	92
55.	Expertise Required for the Conducting of Educational Research by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	93
56.	Expertise Required for Curriculum Development by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	93
57.	Expertise Required for Knowledge of Students' Rights by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	94
58.	Expertise Required for Development and Implementing of Teacher Inservice Programs by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	95
59.	Expertise Required for Working Knowledge of Legal Aspects of Education by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	95
60.	Expertise Required for Long-Range Planning of Programs by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	96
61.	Expertise Required for Public Relations by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	97
62.	Expertise Required for Maintaining Good Staff Morale by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	97
63.	Expertise Required for Planning and Conducting Faculty Meetings by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	98

Table

Page

64.	Expertise Required for the Planning and Conducting of Faculty Meetings by Secondary School Enrollment Categories using a Multiple Range Test:Least Square Difference Procedure .	99
65.	Expertise Required for Orientation of New Staff Members by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	99
66.	Expertise Required for Promotion of Professional Growth of Teachers by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	100
67.	Expertise Required for Maintaining Effective Communications with Students by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	101
68.	Expertise Required for Keeping the Superintendent Informed by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	101
69.	Expertise Required for Input into Teacher Selection and Assignment by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	102
70.	Expertise Required for Representing the School in Associations by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	103
71.	Expertise Required for Working with Advisory Committees by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	103
72.	Expertise Required for Plant Management by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	104
73.	Expertise Required for Plant Management by Years of Experience Categories using a Multiple Range Test:Least Square Difference Procedure	105

Table

Page

74.	Expertise Required for Distribution of Allocated Funds by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	105
75.	Expertise Required for the Distribution of Allocated Funds by Enrollment Categories using Multiple Range Test:Least Square Difference Procedure	106
76.	Expertise Required for Development of Building Policies for Students and Staff by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals	107
77.	Ranks of Thirty-one Tasks According to the Importance of each Task as Perceived by 200 Iowa Secondary School Principals	108
78.	Ranks of Thirty-one Tasks According to the Expertise Required to Complete each Task as Perceived by 200 Iowa Secondary School Principals	110

Chapter 1

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

The tasks of the secondary school principalship have increased and changed considerably in the past one hundred years. Edmonson, Roemer and Bacon described these changes in the principalship when they wrote:

. . . Its evolution may be divided into five stages. First, the principal of the one room secondary school had influence mainly with the pupils in his own classes. Second, when two or more teachers were required in the school, one was designated as head teacher or principal. His chief duty, aside from teaching a full schedule of classes, was that of maintaining discipline. Third, as the school continued to grow, several teachers were employed, and the responsibilities and influence of the principal expanded. His leadership broadened, and he began to exert a more vital influence over the pupils of the school, the program offered, and relationships in the community. Fourth, the point was finally reached, as the school continued to grow, where the principal was increasingly freed from teaching duties. He was now in a better position to devote his attention to the school as a whole. Such matters as supervision, discipline, organization, public relations, and personnel work were given more attention. Fifth, as the school enrollment increased still further and many high schools became large and complex organizations, vice principals, deans, heads of departments, and clerical help became part of the school organization. The principal became more and more a professional as details of administration and problems of students were centered in these various administrative assistants. His function became that of coordinating the efforts of all individuals under him, integrating the school as a whole,

keeping in touch with outside agencies, and devoting attention to professional improvements and progressive programs.¹

As schools became more complex, the tasks of the principal have changed. These changes can be attributed, not only to the increasing complexity of the school, but to many factors that have permeated the social fabric of society. Changing lifestyles, shifts in priorities of parents and students, new social expectations and values, the increase in litigation, changing expectations of teachers, and student unrest are some of the factors that have also contributed to the changing tasks of the principal. External pressures have mandated changes in the role of the secondary principalship. Leonard E. Kraft recognized this when he wrote:

These are exciting times for those who are interested in studying the role of the secondary school principal. Few administrative roles are more vulnerable to the changing demands of society.²

Changes in the role of the secondary school principalship and the resultant changes in tasks, due to this changing role, have forced the principal to reorganize this perception of tasks and their relative importance to the

¹J. B. Edmonson, Joseph Roemer, and Francis Bacon, The Administration of the Modern Secondary School (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953), pp. 78-79.

²Leonard E. Kraft, The Secondary School Principal in Action (New York: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1971), p. xiii.

position. Kraft places focus on this reorganization when he stated:

Two major challenges confront our public schools today. (1) The changing concept of the world in which we live, and (2) the development of the ability to cope with change.¹

The adaptability of the principal to cope with change and not to become frustrated is a challenge to each principal. Author Robert McGee, as quoted by Kraft, indicated that one possible factor in the ability to accept changes may be dependent upon the maturity and administrative experience level of the principal. McGee emphasized his feelings when he wrote: "There is a standard built in hazard of maturity and experience which centers around the temptation to refer to the 'good old days'."² McGee felt that experienced administrators often become frustrated by the rapid changes and their effects on education. McGee implied that the administrator with more experience and maturity may try to solve today's problems with yesterday's solutions.

Research by the National Association of Secondary School Principals has been conducted in the area of school enrollment and its possible importance to the administrator. The increase in school size in the early 1950's and the 1960's was a result of the rapid birth rate after World War

¹Kraft, p. 5.

²Kraft, p. 64.

II. In the 1970's, school enrollment leveled off and began to decline. This decline started another increase in the size of schools because of consolidation of school districts and inner city schools. The summary of the research conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals poses the following questions in regard to school size:

(1) Does the trend toward larger schools imply different formal and on the job training? (2) What administrative competencies will be required with larger schools, more programs, greater public demands for accountability, and serious shortcomings in faculty competence?¹

The report further concluded in its summary:

Size factors are fundamental in the management of any organization. Changes in size cause a ripple effect of communications, interpersonal relationships, leadership expectations, control procedures, and budget administration, for instance. To be successful in 1977, the principal must employ procedures effective in larger institutions, procedures perhaps unwarranted or unnecessary in the smaller school of 1965. In sum, the typical principalship required different professional skills in 1977 based on the single factor of shifts in school size. When the many other factors of change over the past decade are added to school size, the pervasive transformation of the job can be more clearly viewed.²

¹David R. Byrne, Susan A. Hines and Lloyd E. McCleary, The Senior High School Principalship, the National Survey (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978), p. 61.

²Byrne et al., p. 43.

Statement of the Problem

The study was conducted to determine secondary school principals' perceptions of importance of identified tasks and their perceptions of expertise to manage those same tasks.

Rationale

The changing demands of society and the increasing complexity of the school setting have been factors in the changing of tasks of the secondary school principal. It is important to have knowledge of practicing secondary school principals perceptions of tasks that are job related. As stated by the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the training programs for perspective principals and the inservice programs for practicing principals may need to be revised. Investigation into the effects of the factors of school size and administrative experience on the principals' perceptions can give further focus and direction in meeting the challenges and demands of the principalship.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to obtain practicing principals' perceptions of importance of identified tasks and the perceived amount of expertise needed to manage each given task. For the purpose of analysis, the variables of experience and school size were examined to determine if

they are significant in the identifying of the perceived importance of tasks and the expertise required to manage the tasks.

Significance of the Study

Awareness of practicing principals' perceptions can be very useful in the selection of course content in graduate schools and the choosing of topics for administrative workshops and inservice programs. If factors of size and/or experience do affect to a significant degree the principals' perceptions of importance and/or expertise required, it would be beneficial to have administrative workshops and inservices that are grouped according to school size and/or experience of the administrator.

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. There are no differences concerning the perceived importance of each administrative task of secondary principals of varying administrative experience.
2. There are no differences concerning the perceived importance of each administrative task of secondary principals of schools of differing size categories.
3. There are no differences concerning the perceived expertise required to manage each administrative task of secondary principals of varying administrative

experience.

4. There are no differences concerning the perceived expertise required to manage each administrative task of secondary principals of schools of differing size categories.

Definitions

Secondary Principals of varying administrative experience. Principals of varying administrative experience were systematically selected and divided into three distinct categories. Breakdown of the three categories are as follows:

1. One through eight years.
2. Nine through twelve years.
3. Thirteen through highest.

Secondary Principals of schools of differing size categories. Principals of schools of differing sizes were systematically selected and divided into three distinct categories. Breakdown of the three categories is as follows:

1. 32 to 200 student enrollment in the top three grades.
2. 201 to 400 student enrollment in the top three grades.
3. 401 and above student enrollment in the top three grades.

Assumptions

It is assumed that the principals' reported perceptions are a true indication of their actual feelings in regard to the identified tasks they were asked to rate.

Limitations

1. This study is limited to a set number of identified tasks as determined by a review of literature.
2. This study only includes Iowa secondary school principals.
3. Only public secondary school principals in the state of Iowa are incorporated in this study.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 presents the background of the topic, the problem, the rationale, and the significance of the study.

Chapter 2 is a review of literature as it pertains to this study.

Chapter 3 describes the designs of this study and the methodology that will be used.

Chapter 4 contains a statistical analysis of the collected data.

Chapter 5 presents a discussion of results of this study and their possible implications for future studies.

Chapter 2

RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

Overview

The tracing of major events in the development of American education provides information that is useful to a better understanding of the complex tasks presently confronting principals of today's public secondary schools.

As Ovard stated:

. . . To give him [the principal] some basis for the right decision making, he [the principal] should know some of the history, major events, and objectives that have shaped American education. Only by such a study can he [the principal] have the insight into the changing society and its effect on the secondary school.¹

The effective principal needs to keep abreast of the changing attitudes of society and the demands that are placed upon the schools. As stated in the Senior High School Principalship summary report:

The increased complexity of schools requires that the principal assume new management tasks. Time demand problems are largely caused by serious management overload. Severe managerial problems began with the dramatic increase in school size which occurred between 1965 and 1977. An overload in such matters as supervision and discipline

¹Glen F. Ovard, Administration of the Changing Secondary School (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966), p. 92.

resulted from this growth. Meanwhile new demands came from parents, teachers, and students for accessibility to the principal. To continue the brief scenario, externally imposed requirements such as due process, accountability, union contracts, mandated programs, and similar demands added to the management overload.¹

The tasks of the principal have become more complex as schools have grown in size and have expanded their functions. These developments have created challenges for those who are principals as well as those who seek to become principals. Kamm, Raubinger and Sumption stated:

. . . some who aspire to become a principal have little conception of the demands and possibilities of the position. . . . The truth is that although many seek to become principals, there is a shortage of those who are really prepared to take on the task of leadership.²

In order to gain an understanding of what knowledge and skills are necessary to perform effectively as a principal, further research must be conducted as to how practicing principals perceive their jobs and the importance they identify with the tasks they perform. Jacobson, Reavis and Logsdon give support for the call for further research in this area when they stated:

The experience of persons who have held principalships and the professional literature

¹Lloyd E. McCleary and Scott D. Thomson, The Senior High School Principalship, Vol. III. The Summary Report. (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979), p. 92.

²Richard M. Kamm, Fredrick M. Raubinger and Merle R. Sumption, Leadership in the Secondary School (Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company, 1974), p. 59.

on the subject reveal a surprising spread in the demands on the time, energy, and ingenuity of principals in town and city school systems. The tasks that principals are expected to perform vary greatly in importance. Many of these duties are little more than clerical; others may involve momentous consequences both to the school system and to the principals concerned. Since none of the responsibilities of the principalship can be neglected, it is apparent that those who occupy this position should acquire a comprehensive understanding of the demands that must be met. Mere knowledge of these responsibilities, however, is not sufficient to insure successful performance. Their relative importance also must be clearly understood.¹

This chapter will include the literature, the major events and the changing demands that have necessitated changes in the principalship and the tasks that confront present-day principals. The related research reviewed in this chapter will be presented as follows:

1. The development of American education and of the secondary school principalship prior to 1950 will be traced. After 1950 the principalship began to become more complex. As stated by Kellams: "Educational administration as a science or even a discipline historically began around the year 1950."²

2. The important factors that have influenced and

¹Paul B. Jacobson, James D. Logsdon and William C. Reavis, The Effective School Principal (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1963), p. 3.

²Darrell Kellams, The Role of Principals Today Tracing its Development (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary Principals, 1979), p. 88.

changed the public schools and the tasks of the secondary principal from the 1950's to the present time (1980) will be investigated.

Part I: The Development of American Education
and of the Secondary School Principalship
Prior to 1950

The exact date of the first secondary school principalship and the first principal are not known. However, it is known that the principalship predates the superintendency and the elementary principalship. Jacobson et al. stated: "The high school principalship is the oldest administrative position in American education."¹

Early American schools were modeled after the European schools. The emphasis of these schools was to prepare students for one of the professions such as law, medicine or religion. Because of the selectiveness of these early schools and the narrowness of the curriculum, very few youngsters of school age attended school. Therefore, most young people did not receive any type of formal education. In addition to the narrowness of the curriculum and the selectiveness of the early American schools, probably the most paramount reason for non-attendance was that a formal education was not necessary in the obtaining of employment. As Kamm et al. stated: "Perhaps as many as

¹Jacobson et al., p. 491.

300 public high schools were in operation in 1860, but they were small, selective, and served very few of the boys and girls of secondary school age."¹ The abundance of jobs requiring manual labor and the lack of child labor laws meant that the very young through their own desire, or at times by force, entered the labor market.

Because of the small enrollment, the early secondary school principal served primarily as a teacher who was recognized as the head teacher or master teacher and was in charge of one or two other teachers in the school. The principal's in-school tasks were not great in number as his/her job was just emerging and the meagerness of enrollment meant that his/her main in-school task was to teach. However, there were a number of out-of-school tasks associated with the job of headmaster. Jacobson et al. elaborated on some of the duties or tasks that were part of the principal's job when he/she was not in the schoolhouse:

The duties of master or principal of the early colonial secondary school were extremely varied. In addition to teaching and administering his school, he often served as town clerk, church chorister, official visitor of the sick, bell-ringer of the church, grave digger, court messenger and performed other occasional duties.²

A specific example of the in-school tasks associated with an early American administrator is noted by F. C. Ensign

¹Kamm et al., p. 4.

²Jacobson et al.

when he wrote:

. . . and while we look to Ezekiel Cheever as a great school master and educational authority, he was not in the modern sense, an administrator, he taught and flogged and wrote. He inspired boys, he stood a worthy type of citizenship in his community, but his administrative duties were limited to the routine of a little school and, at most, to an organization requiring but one teacher in addition to himself.¹

The tasks associated with the principalship began to change and increase in number as cities began to grow in population as a result of the American Industrial Revolution. The task of inspecting and examining the performance of other teachers became a duty of the principal in the larger cities. As Jacobson et al. noted:

As early as 1867 the principals in some of the schools in Boston were relieved of their teaching duties for part of each day, and in other schools one or two half days a week were set aside for inspection and examination of classes other than their own.²

The growth of the cities brought about an increase in the schools' enrollment. The population movement from small towns and rural areas was not the only reason that schools began to grow in enrollment. Immigrants from Europe, Asia and other parts of the world came to American cities to find employment and hopefully security for their families.

¹F. C. Ensign, "Evolution of the High School Principalship," School Review, XXXI (March 1923), 181-182, cited by Jacobson et al., p. 492.

²Jacobson et al., pp. 494-495.

As city schools began to increase in enrollment, the tasks of the principal began to become more complex and time consuming. The following statement by Pierce indicates the expanding of the principals' tasks in the city schools:

By the middle of the nineteenth century the status of the principalship in large cities was as follows: (1) a teaching male principal was the controlling head of the school; (2) . . . primary departments had women principals under the direction of the male principal; and (3) the principal had prescribed duties which were limited largely to discipline, routine administrative acts, and grading of pupils in various rooms.¹

As a result of increased population in the cities, the era of the small selective school came to an end and that of the public school began. The coming of age of the public school as a dominant type of school was slow in its development.

As noted by Kamm et al.: "By 1890, though it was still small in number and had a total enrollment of only slightly more than 200,000, the public high school had emerged as a dominate type of secondary school. . . ."²

Another factor that led to the growth in the enrollment of public schools was the changing attitude of the American public concerning the need for an education. It was observed by Ovard that:

¹Paul R. Pierce, The Origin and Development of the Public School Principalship (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935), p. 9, cited by Jacobson et al., p. 494.

²Kamm et al., p. 6.

The technological advances during the 1920's and the great depression during the 1930's created a strong new feeling that children needed to have a high school education. Such attitudes were made into laws. By 1940, the free public high school not only existed, but every child was expected to be enrolled unless an exception was granted through established legal agencies.¹

Mandatory education had some important implications in regard to the tasks of the secondary principal. For the first time, the principal was required to manage all school age children regardless of the child's desire to go to school. The keeping of attendance records and making sure that truancy was kept to a minimum became important functions of the principal and his staff.

As early as 1938, the complexity of the educational process began to take on new dimensions. The emergence of the public high school, mandatory attendance, and the changing of societal attitudes toward the necessity of an education brought about a change in emphasis regarding the scope of the curriculum and the needs of all students. An indication of the curriculum to meet student needs was cited in the New York Regent's report of 1938. The following excerpt was taken from the report.

What has become increasingly clear is that school experiences must be planned in terms of life goals of adolescent boys and girls, rather than the traditional academic patterns, and that these goals must be suited to the astonishing diversity that exists in respect to abilities, needs and interests.

¹Ovard, p. 96.

Some years ago the success of the secondary school might have been estimated from the subsequent college careers of its students; today the criterion must be sought in the relevancy of high school offerings to the needs of the entire population.¹

As early as 1913, committees for the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education were aware that there was a need to change and expand the public schools' goals. "The principals spoke of citizenship education, vocational education, an enriched curriculum, and more attention to those students (then a majority) who did not plan to go on to college."² As the curriculum began to expand and special educational programs were started, the tasks of the secondary principal spread beyond the basic educational core of subjects into the areas of curriculum development and evaluation of programs. Knezevich pointed out that a change was needed in the appraisal of the secondary principals' tasks when he stated: "The introduction of special subjects and special teachers demands a more realistic appraisal of the role (tasks) of the chief administrator of a public secondary school attendance center."³

¹Ruth E. Eckert and Thomas D. Marshall, When Youth Leave School (New York: The McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1938), pp. 3-4, cited by Kamm et al., p. 20.

²Kamm et al., p. 8.

³Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1975), p. 391.

In addition to the emphasis placed on meeting the needs of students through expanding the curriculum, there began to be more emphasis on the development of extra-curricular activities which in turn added to the expanding list of tasks to be performed by the secondary school principal. Reference to this was given by Jacobson et al. when they stated:

The organization and supervision of the extra-curricular duties in both elementary and high school have become increasingly important since 1920. How such duties are cared for constitutes a challenge to the principal's competence as a school administrator.¹

From the relatively few school associated administrative tasks of the early 1800's has emerged a growing list of tasks associated with the performance of a principalship. Factors such as the American Industrial Revolution, the growth of cities, mandatory education, advancements in technology and meeting the needs of the student in school activities as well as in extracurricular activities have added considerably to the demands on the principal and subsequently to the tasks associated with the principalship.

Overshadowing these prementioned factors of change and permeating them at every level was the influx of people from rural communities and from foreign countries. It is no

¹Jacobson et al., p. 496.

wonder that the phrase "the melting pot" was coined to express how American society was changing due to the different backgrounds, desires, beliefs and goals of these people as they migrated to the cities. Society was not only changing, but it was becoming more and more complex. Yeager placed the challenge before the schools when he wrote:

All that our citizens wish for their children which may be in harmony with democratic principles and ideals and not otherwise adequately provided in the social order should be the work of the public schools.¹

Hagman emphasized the emerging needs of society when he wrote: "The widening task of education is made evident at every turn as the administrator seeks his educational bearings in the demands of society upon the schools."²

In a 1948 report in the Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, the following statement was made concerning the role of the school.

To the public school, unique among institutions, falls the task of providing the experiences through which its students develop the fullest complement of patterns necessary to the success of the democratic experiment. Among them are the

¹William A. Yeager, Home-School-Community Relations (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1939), pp. 22-23.

²Harlan L. Hagman, The Administration of American Public Schools (York, Pennsylvania: The Maple Press Company, 1951), p. 17.

patterns of home-maker, skillful artificer of things and ideals, appreciator of the beautiful, wise buyer and consumer, intelligent chooser from among alternative and often conflicting moral goals, policy maker and myriads more. . . .¹

As society became more complex, the demands and expectations made by society on the schools' function and overall administration have increased. These demands have changed the role of the principal and the tasks that he performs. As stated by Knezevich: "The role of the secondary administrator has changed as the institution's purposes and pupils have changed."²

Until the 1950's, the purpose of the secondary school was defined and the goals of Americanization of immigrants and minorities were prime tasks of the schools. As Yeager emphasized, it was the duty of the schools to develop democratic principles and ideals. In short, it was the duty of the schools to take away the foreignness and the differences of ethnic and minority groups and in their place ingrain within those groups democratic principles and ideals so that they would be prepared to enter and succeed in the mainstream of American society.

Prior to the 1950's, the changes and demands placed

¹"The Expanding Role of Education," Twenty-Sixth Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1948), p. 29, cited by Hagman, p. 17.

²Knezevich, p. 390.

on education were subtle and slow in developing. Consequently, the increasing role of the secondary school principal and his/her associated tasks were relatively slow in developing and expanding. The past thirty years (1950-1980) have led to a change in the slow development of the tasks associated with the principalship that had previously prevailed. Factors from within the school as well as from outside the school have promoted the addition of tasks and have changed the role of the principal at a rapid and sometimes alarming rate.

The decades of the fifties, sixties and seventies ushered in the realization that the lofty goals of the Americanization process were being challenged as well as other democratic principles and beliefs. In order to cope with this realization, the principal has had to obtain new knowledge and expertise in areas of importance to the secondary school principalship.

Part II: Important Factors that have Influenced
and Changed the Public Schools and the Tasks
of the Secondary Principal from the 1950's
to the Present Time (1980)

Paramount to the changes that have occurred in the last thirty years, 1950-1980, are the changing values and expectations of American society which have had an influence on the schools and the tasks of the principalship. The so-called "melting pot" theory which implied that immigrants would be assimilated into the American culture and

become equal in all aspects to other Americans fell into disrepute during this period. It had been the task of the schools to provide the needed general ingredients that were necessary to Americanize immigrants and minority groups in America. As noted by Epps, this task has had some overriding diverse effects:

Both the assimilative and discriminative forces are apparent in the monocultural curriculum of the schools and the systematic relationship between schooling and social mobility. The assimilative force has made it possible for the children of Poles, Germans, Swedes, Italians, and Irishmen to blend with the descendants of earlier European immigrants. On the other hand, the discriminative force has made it extremely difficult for the children of recent immigrants and racial minorities to acquire the quality and quantity of education required for successful competition in the occupational system of an urbanized technological society.¹

The American dream of the earlier portion of the century of "from rags to riches" as exemplified by the stories of Horatio Alger were being considered as impossible or improbable to achieve by minorities and immigrants who were Americanized. The process of Americanization was being viewed by these groups of minorities and immigrants as a dead end that was not helping them to advance occupationally and socially toward a better way of life. More and more the trend was away from loss of ethnic identity and toward promoting a pluralistic society with all the diverse

¹Edgar G. Epps, Cultural Pluralism (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974), p. 175.

backgrounds of minority groups and immigrants. The development of a pluralistic society and the changing values of the society were viewed by Watson:

During the 20 year period from 1954 to 1974 this nation was confronted with a number of critical issues: war, civil rights activity, equal opportunity, civil disorder and a growing mistrust of public institutions. An examination of the critical issues reveals two primary themes. The first is characterized by American's confrontation with the reality of pluralism, a confrontation brought on by the demise of the myth of the "melting pot" and a consequent quickening of the struggle for equality waged by various ethnic and minority groups. The second theme is characterized by a crisis in meaning precipitated by a growing disillusionment regarding many aspects of American society and the consequent challenges to societal values and institutions.¹

Watson concluded:

. . . the most critical challenge facing school administrators is that of reorientating their perspectives and behaviors to relate to the reality of pluralism and to the shift in values in order that the schools may achieve their lofty goals.²

The rise of cultural pluralism and the struggle for equality of ethnic and minority groups has led to many issues and concerns that have permeated virtually all of society and in turn the schools. Issues and concerns that school administrators were ill prepared to deal with

¹Bernard C. Watson, "Issues Confronting Educational Administrators, 1954-1974," Educational Administration, the Developing Decades, eds. Lavern Cunningham, Walter G. Hack and Ralph O. Nystrand (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977), p. 67.

²Watson, p. 44.

effectively have arisen from within as well as from outside the school. In an effort to meet these societal issues and concerns, a rapid expansion of the tasks and challenges of the secondary school principalship ensued. Criticism and concern for the nation's schools abounded as Ovard observed:

Since 1950, the concern about and criticism of our public schools have multiplied, divided, and multiplied. Seldom have so many newspapers, magazines, journals, periodicals, and books featured education as the center piece of journalistic endeavor.¹

In the remainder of this chapter, the researcher will reveal some of the implications and realities of cultural pluralism, societal changes and the changing nature of secondary school students that have led to the increasing number of tasks for the principal in the past thirty years (1950-1980). The following areas will be investigated as contributing to the increase in tasks of the secondary school principal: (1) Changing Expectations of Society, (2) Student Activism, (3) Teacher Activism and (4) The Courts and the Schools.

Changing Expectations of Society

Cultural pluralism has led to many changes in which groups of people demanded a voice in the development and implementation of programs in the secondary schools. As Gorton observed: "If there is one great truth that is

¹Ovard, p. 84.

coming through to education now--it is this: the people of the ghetto, the poor, and the powerless are demanding and must have involvement in our schools."¹ Not only were demands being made from different groups, there were demands that principals had not previously encountered. As Watson wrote:

In what was really a very short period of time, American schools had to adjust to a new context of policy making and governance, balancing all of the new participants and priorities while they tried to create effective responses to major societal problems whose roots lay within and outside the immediate sphere of education. The task fell most heavily on the shoulders of school administrators whose positions in the school hierarchy and in the interstices between school and society made them agents through which the current of change were translated into the schools.²

It appears that most of the social issues and events during the past thirty years (1950-1980) have had some effect on the American school system and in most instances on the tasks of the principal. In the majority of instances, the schools were either blamed for the existence of a condition or they were expected to alleviate the condition. As Watson stated:

¹Harold Howe, Respect, Engagement, Responsibility, the Struggle to Power in the Public Schools (Washington, D.C.: National Committee for the Support of Public Schools, 1968), p. 69, cited by Richard A. Gorton, Conflict, Controversy, and Crisis in School Administration and Supervision: Issues, Cases, and Concepts for the 70's (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company Publishers, 1972), p. 25.

²Watson, p. 77.

Virtually all of the issues with which Americans struggled in the period 1954-1974 had a profound impact on the schools. . . . Every aspect of schooling from governance, financing, student and employee personnel practices (hiring, assigning, promoting, testing, evaluating, disciplining and so on), curricular content, school community relations, and policy making came under attack.¹

In response to these attacks, principals attempted to become more politically orientated and to deal with the task of trying to develop sound school community relations. A study conducted by the National Parent Teacher Association confirmed the need for better school community relations when it revealed that ". . . half of the local P.T.A. organizations that were surveyed, parent-school relationships were in difficulty."² Principals found that it was difficult to identify the power structure of the community as the effects of pluralism has led to groups having considerable power that were previously without clout.

Burlingame emphasized this when he wrote:

On the local scene for example, communities are more diverse, expectations and demands for resources are more ambiguous and vocal, power and authority are more diffuse, and public participation in the affairs of the schools is more intense.³

¹Watson, p. 73.

²C. Ryan, "Parent Power: Prelude to Dialogue," Compact, III (April 1969), 30-33, cited by Gorton.

³Martin Burlingame, Fred D. Combs, Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Paul W. Thurston, Educational Governance and Administration (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1980), p. 15.

Identification of the sources of community power was a difficult task but not as difficult as working with some of the groups once they were known. For many of these groups, this was the first time that they had clout and they intended to use it to gain and maintain as much control as possible over the school. The principal found that dealing effectively with a pluralistic community was difficult. As Gorton observed: "An inescapable conclusion is that the task of maintaining and improving school community relations is a challenging and sometimes frustrating one."¹ Even though the task of community relations is a difficult one, it is a task that must be handled effectively by principals to provide communication and understanding. As written by Jones in the text Secondary School Administration: "A major task of educational leadership is to restore to the public a sense of security and confidence in the schools."² In order to achieve the goal of restoring confidence in the school, the schools began to provide additional services and to accept added responsibilities as a means to solve inequities and societal problems. This was emphasized by Drake and Roe when they stated: "Educators, naively

¹Gorton.

²James Jones, Jackson C. Salisbury and Ralph L. Spencer, Secondary School Administration (New York: McGraw Hill Company, 1969), p. 123.

responded with pleas for more resources and more time with children as a means to solve society's problems."¹ If these inequities and problems could be resolved, a re-establishment of trust by the public in the American school system could result. To achieve this end, larger attendance units were created so that specialized personnel could be hired and special facilities made available to the student population that would have been of extreme cost per pupil at a smaller attendance center. This increase of services brought about an increase in tasks that the principal had to perform. As Jones observed: "Another contributing factor to the complexity of leadership in the secondary school has been the increased school services."²

The task of the principal was not only that of additional supervision and evaluation of the personnel in the added service area but the principal also had to become knowledgeable of the programs and the contents of those programs in his building. In conjunction with these new tasks, the principal was required to gain expertise in the areas of support services in the school district. Burlingame emphasized this when he wrote:

¹Thelbert L. Drake and William H. Roe, The Principalship (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1980), p. 381.

²Jones et al.

Of particular importance is their (the principals') knowledge about and assessment of the capabilities of specialists available from the central office of the district. In this capacity, principals can bring district resources to bear on particular problems of the school.¹

Knezevich contended that the principal should seek the services and utilize the specialists available to his school in order to help teachers do a more effective job when he stated:

The instructional leadership role of the principal is one of marshalling resources--human and material--that classroom teachers require to perform effectively. . . . A principal fulfills his role as instructional leader by helping teachers obtain consultant services needed to do a more effective job, rather than by attempting to supervise teachers himself.²

The task of program supervision has become so specialized that the principal is well advised to utilize the central office and district services in the supervision of special programs. The changing expectations of society have brought about subsequent changes in America's secondary schools. These changing expectations and the unique expectations brought forth by ethnic and minority groups as society becomes more pluralistic has led to significant changes in the tasks and role of the secondary school principal. The principal has had to develop and is still developing those skills

¹Burlingame et al., p. 291.

²Knezevich, pp. 393-394.

needed to cope effectively with a society that has placed new expectations and demands on the public secondary school over the past thirty years (1950-1980).

Student Activism

The change in traditional values and goals of society in the past thirty years (1950-1980) has led to confusion and questioning by America's youth. Areas of previous sanctity such as the principal's, teacher's and parent's authority as well as school rules concerning individual rights, dress codes and other regulations imposed by society and the schools were being questioned. As some of the previous values held by society were challenged by the recognition of the pluralistic nature of the population, the youth of the country began to wonder if the values they had previously accepted were just and fair. As other minority segments of society became at times militant and demanding, the demands of students became more demanding and at times rebellious. As Watson wrote:

Student activism and rebellion became a phenomenon and a crisis in the 1960's. Amidst affluence, anxiety, social malaise, an unpopular war, a generation gap developed into a veritable cultural revolution. . . . Young people appeared to be unified in a common demand that recognition of the rights of youth to self expression and self determination be ensured--the right, in some respects, to "do their own thing." Thus emerged the crisis over students' rights and power, a crisis that is part of the problem of pluralism in that it challenges the larger society to acknowledge the

needs, interests and desire for self determination of another minority element.¹

Protests occurred on many of America's college campuses that involved among other issues American participation in the Vietnam war and the ending of the conscription of Americans into the armed forces. As these protests continued and were often suppressed, such basic democratic ideals as freedom of speech and self expression began to become important issues to both college and secondary school students. Secondary school students discontent in these and other areas brought about their questioning and at times their demanding of change in the schools. The principal as head of the school, or that person who was most available to students, was confronted by student bodies in secondary schools across the nation to meet the demands of disgruntled students. As Knezevich observed: "By the end of the 1960's one survey of over 1,000 secondary school principals reported that a majority experienced some kind of protest."²

In expressing their demands, if turned down by the administration, students used sit-in strikes, underground publications and other methods to make their causes known. As noted by Burlingame et al.:

¹Watson, pp. 70-71.

²Knezevich, p. 436.

The classroom of uncooperative adolescents trying to "break in," a demanding neophyte teacher, or the large student protest groups on campus in the late 1960's and early 1970's, operate on the principle that the ability to make their discontents known is the first step toward changing policy. Sometimes just creating an issue is enough to get the ball rolling your way.¹

The task that confronted the principal was the developing of skills and procedures to deal with students' demands and students' protests. It became increasingly important that the principal accept the task of continuous updating and evaluation of the schools' disciplinary rules, dress code policy and curriculum policy as these areas were of great importance to student activists. The principal found it difficult to deal with the task of controlling students and meeting their demands for change. As Knezevich wrote: "Administrators were hard pressed to cope with the tactics of secondary school activists during a decade of dissent."²

Much to the relief of the high school principal, the well remembered period of heightened student activism has appeared to have reached a peak in the decades of the sixties and the early seventies. Knezevich stated that the reduction in student activism is a result of changing conditions when he wrote: "It could be that the basic causes

¹Burlingame et al., p. 115.

²Knezevich, pp. 436-437.

have been removed such as termination of an unpopular war, the ending of the draft, and the modification of restrictive and arbitrary dress and behavior codes."¹ For whatever reason, student activism is in a dormant period at the present time. However, the task remains to maintain the expertise and to expand the communicative skills of the principals so that they may effectively cope with mass student unrest if it again appears on the campuses of the secondary school.

Teacher Activism

Another group that struck forth in an effort to realize their common needs and desire for self determination was that of the public school teacher. Historically, teachers have had little to do with unionism or politics. Epstein noted this when he wrote:

As of 1962, there had not yet been written any true collectively-negotiated agreement between any school board and its teachers anywhere in the country. In fact, not a single state had enacted legislation permitting teachers of public schools to negotiate in good faith and mandating school boards to negotiate. Terms like bargaining unit, mediation, fact-finding, and binding arbitration were almost unknown to the great mass of professional educators.²

As evidenced by the success of other minority groups,

¹Knezevich, p. 437.

²Benjamin Epstein, Principals: An Organized Force for Leadership (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1974), p. 1.

teachers became interested in improving their overall conditions which has caused the role of the principal and the tasks that he performs to expand and become more complex.

As Goldhammer observed:

Among the influences changing the character of the customary arenas in which educational administrators operated, the new pluralism impelled groups of employees to demand greater consideration for their unique interests to form unions or other active associations, to employ professional representatives, and to force recognition of their right to involvement in the process of decision making.¹

As teachers became more organized and assertive, it became apparent to them that strong professional associations or union membership was the most proficient way to quickly challenge and in many instances gain control of those decisions which had previously been strictly in the domain of the principal. Teachers have negotiated master contracts with superintendents and school boards that have placed many restrictions on the decision making process of the principal. Weldy observed that in one master contract, that was developed over a twelve-year period, the principal was mentioned specifically sixty times. Weldy stated the following list of areas in which the principal's control was limited or additional tasks imposed because of the

¹Keith Goldhammer, "Roles of the American School Superintendent, 1954-1974," Educational Administration, the Developing Decades, eds. Cunningham, Hack and Nystrand, p. 156.

implementing of the provisions of the master contract.

1. Length and frequency of faculty meetings.
2. Length of school day.
3. The number of students that can be placed in a class.
4. The number of classes and periods teachers may be assigned.
5. The number of consecutive periods a teacher may be assigned.
6. The number of different classrooms a teacher may be assigned.
7. The teachers' non-teaching duties.
8. The length of the teachers' lunch period.
9. Provision of clerical assistance for teachers.
10. The requirement to notify teachers before a supervisory observation.
11. The length of a supervisory visit.
12. The requirement to hold conferences, make "constructive" suggestions, and place in writing reports of supervisory visits.
13. Elaborate and laborious steps of due process for discipline or dismissal of teachers.
14. Teacher participation guaranteed in decision making on school schedules, textbook selection, school policies.
15. Grievance procedures that invariably begin with the principal.
16. Provision of telephone service, offices, lunch rooms, teaching equipment, and clean parking lots.¹

¹Gilbert R. Weldy, Principals What they Do and Who They Are (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979), pp. 32-33.

Because of master contract restrictions and limitations, the tasks of the principal and the expertise needed have become more complex in areas that were in the past not influenced or altered by master contract restrictions.

Burlingame et al. noted that: "Nowhere has the power structure of education changed more rapidly than in respect to the role that teachers are playing in the development of policy."¹ Re-assessment of previous task areas to allow for the control obtained by teachers is critical in areas such as student scheduling, planning for extra curricular activities, evaluation of teachers, curriculum development, teacher due process, teacher dismissal and the development of building policies.

Teachers have bargained for and have received an increased voice in the organization and the running of the school. However, Boyan has contended:

The discrepancy between teachers' professional aspirations for enlarged participation in decision-making in education as an expert endeavor and their reluctance to assume greater responsibility for self regulation as professionals generates continuous tensions in teacher-administrator relationships.²

The task of dealing with this type of tension and promoting and maintaining high staff morale is sometimes a dichotomous

¹Burlingame et al., p. 117.

²Norman J. Boyan, "Emergent Role of the Teacher and the Authority Structure of the School," Journal of Secondary Education, XLII, No. 7 (November 1967), 296, cited by Gorton, p. 69.

task for the principal to perform effectively. In addition to the aforementioned cause of staff-administrator tension, the inclusion of grievance procedures in the master contract has further placed strain on the relationship between the staff and the principal. As Christie stated in regard to the grievance process: "One of the most significant changes that affect teacher-principal relationships is the provision for grievance process to settle disputes."¹ In most instances, the grievance starts at the principal's level which places the principal, in the eyes of the teacher, in a position as his or her adversary. As Christie further noted: "The establishment of grievance procedures, although generally achieving a good end, has in some cases resulted in an intensification of the adversary relationship between teachers and principals."²

In general, the advent of the master contract and the subsequent grievance procedures have increased the amount of duties of the principal. Duties such as lunch-room supervision and help in extra curricular activities, that had been areas in which teachers had traditionally been

¹Samuel G. Christie, "Beyond Teacher Militancy: Implications for Change Within the School," The Power to Change Issues for the Innovative Educator, eds. Carmen M. Culver and Gary J. Hoban (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1973), pp. 132-133.

²Christie, p. 133.

required to provide supervision, are now areas that in many instances are no longer their responsibility due to negotiated master contracts. The task of supervision and control in these areas has fallen increasingly on the shoulders of the principal or, as in the case of the larger school, the assistant principal.

In addition to supervision, the principal has had the task of knowing in what areas restrictions have been placed on his decision making. The task of being well-versed in the provisions of the master contract are of increasing importance in the avoiding of a grievance or in the handling of a grievance that has been filed.

Teacher activism and at times militancy have been areas of concern that principals have had to develop new perspectives in the performance of their jobs as school leaders. As Gorton concluded: ". . . it should be emphasized that the job of coping with teacher militancy is not an easy one for the school administrator. It is a task that is often filled with frustration."¹ The rise of teacher activism and the subsequent changes that have resulted have been and will continue to be areas of concern for the principal of the secondary school.

¹Gorton, p. 69.

The Courts and the Schools

The rise of student and teacher activism has brought forth situations in many schools that challenged the school's authority to impose rules and procedures which were viewed by activists and various interest groups as being in discord with their constitutional rights. In general, the schools, having been challenged infrequently in this area especially by the court system, showed very little flexibility or desire to make any changes in their policies or procedures. As Drake and Roe observed:

. . . when one reviews the litigation regarding the governing of children in school the conclusion is that rather than serving as models of a democratic institution with great reverence for individuals' rights, schools are too often restrictive and repressive.¹

The lack of flexibility and repressiveness in a society, that was becoming pluralistic and showed a growing demand for recognition of various interest groups and minorities, set the scene for ethnic and social challenges of individual rights in the secondary school system. As Drake and Roe further observed: "It can be easily documented that schools in many cases have been inclined to suppress individual's rights and to be quite arbitrary in the suppression of unpopular and minority viewpoints."² This inclination of

¹Drake and Roe, p. 382.

²Drake and Roe, pp. 382-383.

the schools to provide a deaf ear in the area of constitutional rights has led to individual and group challenges being brought to the attention of the courts who were willing to listen and pass judgment. As Goldhammer noted:

American society faced new interpretations of individual rights, liberties, and privileges, reinforced by court actions. . . . Any decision affecting diverse members of the public associated with the schools could become the substance of extensive and expensive litigation. Rights of teachers, parents, students, and the public-- became issues which compelled the time, attention and effort of school administrators. Extensive legal literature had to be digested.¹

Cunningham emphasized the influence of the nation's judicial system on school administration when he stated: "An obvious and important element in the context of educational administration from 1954-1974 is the role and influence of the courts in society and in general in the schools in particular."²

The involvement of the court system in the school and the decisions that they have rendered have had important implications in regard to administrative policies and procedures of the secondary school. As emphasized by Drake and Roe: ". . . during the last decade in particular, the courts have begun to challenge the decisions of

¹Lavern Cunningham, Walter G. Hack and Ralph O. Nystrand, eds., Educational Administration, the Developing Decades (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977), p. 157.

²Cunningham et al., p. 44.

administrators who failed to recognize the constitutional rights of students and teachers."¹ Administrative policies concerning student rights have increasingly come under attack which had led to the task of changing policies which are in violation of student rights and monitoring and evaluating policies which are questionable. As noted by Burlingame et al., the following areas of school policy involving students' rights have been challenged:

In recent years the courts have increasingly turned their attention to the rights of students. Landmark cases, many engineered by the American Civil Liberties Union, have affirmed students rights to dress as they like, print what they want in student newspapers, and express themselves as they please on public issues as long as the educational process was not substantially disrupted. The right to due process of law was strengthened in matters of search and seizure and in disciplinary proceedings.²

The task of evaluating and changing policies as the decisions of the courts are handed down mandates that the principal become knowledgeable and current in the determining of what is legal in his dealings with students, teachers and others who come in contact with the school. The need for the principal to have substantial knowledge and expertise in his handling of policies and procedures was further reinforced by the decision of the United States

¹ Drake and Roe, p. 109.

² Burlingame et al., p. 115.

Supreme Court in Wood vs. Strickland. Drake and Roe stated in regard to this decision:

The court held that an administrator or school board member is not immune from liability for damages if he/she knew or reasonably should have known that an action officially taken would violate the constitutional rights of students.¹

Increased public awareness of their rights has further given impetus to the need for the principal to gain further knowledge and expertise in tasks that involve student discipline, the handling of special education and the developing of building policies and procedures.

For today's principal as well as the principal of the future, the ability to effectively cope with a pluralistic society that has become aware of its rights and the capacity to interpret court decisions and implement procedures that are legal are tasks of great significance toward a gaining of public trust in education. The realization of cultural pluralism and the diversity of the American society have had dramatic effects on the nation and on the expectations of society, students, teachers and courts concerning the functions and goals of the secondary school. The principal's role has undergone extensive change as the number and the complexity of his tasks have increased. As Drake and Roe concluded:

¹Drake and Roe, p. 110.

The world of the principal today is drastically different from the world of the principal when we went to elementary or secondary school. The principal of this decade deals with unfamiliar problems of tension and conflict. The social revolution that has overtaken all our communities to varying degrees has affected curriculum, school organization, discipline, student behavior, community relations, and the very nature of the teaching-learning process itself. Thus, the old ground rules that fashioned our American schools into such similar and unquestioned molds are now largely obsolete.¹

As Drake and Roe also noted: ". . . the principal is a key factor in the survival of any school's effectiveness."² For the principal to be effective, he must become adept in the skills of communication as his position has become one of disseminating information and receiving input from parents, community, teachers, students and groups or individuals who wish to make some kind of impact on the school. To have the capacity to deal effectively with these individuals and groups, the principal must have an understanding of what forces have influenced society and what effect these forces have had on the development of the principalship. As Drake and Roe emphasized:

The principal of today and tomorrow faces a continuously changing environment. The political, social, economic and environmental forces which are influencing our society so dramatically are in turn having dramatic impact on all aspects of the school itself. . . . An important ingredient for

¹Drake and Roe, p. 381.

²Drake and Roe, p. v.

the success of both elementary and secondary school principals operating in this dynamic setting is that they bring to the position a solid foundational base that will give them perspective about our changing society. In addition he/she must have expertise in teaming up with individuals and groups within the formal and informal school organization to make our schools responsive to the changing needs of society.¹

The principalship has evolved from a position of head teacher to a constellation of positions, each requiring varying degrees of expertise. An understanding of the tasks associated with the principalship and the importance of each of these tasks to the administration of each individual school has made the principalship a demanding position. As Knezevich deduced: "Little wonder that this is a demanding position as well as one of considerable significance in determining the direction of public education."² The challenges of the principalship are many, but through an understanding of America's past and present, its educational system and its changing society, the principal can have a significant impact on the future direction of public education.

¹Drake and Roe, p. 381.

²Knezevich, pp. 395-396.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

A detailed description of procedure and the instrument used in this study will be discussed in this chapter.

Design of Study

This study was conducted to determine secondary school principals' perceptions of the importance of identified tasks and the expertise needed to manage them. These perceptions were analyzed to determine what differences exist in perceptions of principals in schools of varying enrollments and among principals of varying experience.

Instrument

Major administrative tasks of a public secondary school principal were identified by conducting a study of related literature. In this review emphasis was placed on professional literature. Articles were identified from the National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin that contained information directly related to the principal and the tasks associated in the performance of his duties. The most active period involving task changes has been found to be since the late 1940's to the present (1980) when the

principal became more than the head teacher of his school. Support for this finding is given by Darrell Kellams, the chairman of the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Nebraska, when he stated:

Educational Administration as a science or even a discipline historically began around the year 1950. At that time, the school administrator started to receive attention apart from the teaching profession generally.¹

The emphasis of the search of related literature to determine tasks of the secondary principal has been focused on the developments of the past thirty years (1950 to 1980).

Additional information was obtained from principals concerning changes in the tasks of the secondary school principal over the last decade (1970 to 1980). The following list indicates areas that were of value in determining the tasks associated with the secondary principalship:

1. Area principal meetings
2. Conference principal meetings
3. School board meetings
4. Inservices for principals
5. State conventions
6. National conventions
7. Department of Public Instruction
8. Area Education Agency
9. Federal agencies

¹Kellams, p. 88.

10. Informal meetings among principals

Information compiled identifying tasks of the secondary principal was used to construct a questionnaire (see Appendix A). This questionnaire was used as the instrument in this study to determine principals' perceptions of importance of the identified task and expertise required to manage them. A cover letter was constructed to explain to the sample principals the purpose of the study and the pertinent information needed to complete the questionnaire (see Appendix B). Each questionnaire was coded so that the returned questionnaire could be identified. The principals were asked to rate their perceptions of the thirty-one identified tasks in regard to the importance of the task and the expertise required to manage that same task. The principals were encouraged to distribute their responses across all levels of importance and expertise using the following instructions (see Appendix C):

I. Circle the number representing the importance of the identified task in your school as you perceive its importance.

1. Major importance
2. Important
3. Minor importance
4. Little importance

II. Circle the number representing the expertise required to manage the identified task as you perceive it

in your school.

1. High degree of expertise requiring detailed knowledge of all aspects of the task.
2. Medium degree of expertise requiring some knowledge of all aspects of the task.
3. Low degree of expertise requiring little knowledge of all aspects of the task.
4. No particular expertise required to manage the task.

Additional information that was requested of each principal in the sample included:

1. Total number of years as a principal.
2. Number of principalships since first becoming a principal.
3. Number of years in present position as principal.

Validation

Validation of the questionnaire was accomplished by submitting copies of the questionnaire to a randomly selected group of twenty-three principals for their recommendations and evaluation. A cover letter was composed (see Appendix D) and a worksheet with specific questions asking the principal to review the instrument in regard to proper balance of areas targeted, needed clarification, needed additions or deletions, was sent with the questionnaire (see Appendix E). Principals were asked to return the

questionnaire with their evaluation of the instrument within a period of one week after the initial mailing date. A self-addressed stamped envelope was provided for this purpose. The returned questionnaires were reviewed to determine if major or minor changes needed to be made. If the responses of the principals had indicated the need for major changes, the questionnaire would have been reconstructed and re-submitted to the same principals for evaluation. The actual review of the returned questionnaire indicated that only minor changes were needed, none of which dealt with additions or deletions to the questions posed in the questionnaire. Therefore, the questionnaire was retained in its original form and used as the instrument in this study.

Population and Sample

The population consisted of public secondary school principals in the state of Iowa. A rank order list of Iowa's public secondary schools according to enrollment in the top three grades was obtained from the Iowa Department of Public Instruction.

A stratified random group was obtained using the following: a coin toss was used to determine if the first or the second school on the list was used. After this determination was made, every second school was chosen for the sample. This process was continued until the end of the

list was reached. Identification of the sample was accomplished by the use of a list of current principals obtained from the Iowa Department of Public Instruction.

The completed list of identified principals served as a checklist for the mailing of the questionnaire and their return after being completed.

Data Collection and Organization

The following procedures were used in sending the cover letter and questionnaire to the identified principals.

1. Questionnaire, cover letter and stamped envelope were sent by mail.
2. A post card was sent to those principals who had not responded within two weeks after the initial mailing of the questionnaire.
3. A minimum number of 120 returned questionnaires was considered necessary in this study. Principals from each identified group who did not return the questionnaire were randomly selected and contacted to determine if their responses were similar to the returned questionnaires in their group. No further attempt was made to contact the remainder of the principals who did not return the questionnaire.

The returned questionnaires were then grouped and tabulated in each of the three enrollment categories. The data was then analyzed across groups of differing enrollment size. A further grouping based on the total number of years

of experience as a principal was conducted. Three experience categories were randomly chosen and are as follows:

1. One through eight years experience as a principal.
2. Nine through twelve years experience as a principal.
3. Thirteen through highest years experience as a principal.

After each questionnaire was placed in the appropriate categories, the data were analyzed to make comparisons across groups of differing years of experience as a principal.

Analysis of Data

The returned and grouped questionnaires were prepared for statistical processing by the Dial Computer Center of Drake University. The Standard Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was utilized in the processing of the data. Means were calculated for each task and a two-factor analysis of variance was conducted for each task. An F value was determined to decide whether or not there were significant differences among the means of the groups being compared. An F value was also calculated to determine if a significant interaction was present. The calculated F value was compared against a .05 critical value of the tabled F ratio. When the F value was larger than the tabled critical value, there was a significant difference among the sample means and the null hypothesis was rejected. When the F

value was less than the tabled critical value, it was determined that no significant difference existed among the sample means and the null hypothesis was retained.

A further test was conducted to determine which of the group means were significantly different from the other means if the F test was significant at the .05 tabled critical value. The test utilized for this purpose was the Fisher Least Significant Difference t Test. The test was used to determine differences between pairs of means. When the calculated t value was found to be greater than the critical value of .05 in the tabled t values a significant difference was determined to exist.

Additional analysis of the data was conducted to indicate the overall numerical order of the identified tasks as perceived by the principals in regard to importance of task and expertise required to manage each task. The rank order for importance of the task and the expertise required to manage the task is presented in table form in Chapter 4. An interpretation of each task was conducted and implications were drawn from each table and discussed.

The null hypotheses tested using the above statistical methods were:

1. There are no differences among the means concerning the perceived importance of each administrative task of secondary principals of varying administrative experience.

2. There are no differences among the means concerning the perceived importance of each administrative task of secondary principals of schools of differing size categories.

3. There are no differences among the means concerning the perceived expertise required to manage each administrative task of secondary school principals of varying administrative experience.

4. There are no differences among the means concerning the perceived expertise required to manage each administrative task of secondary principals of schools of differing size categories.

Statistical Treatment

A two-way analysis of variance was the appropriate statistical tool used in this study. A two-way ANOVA was used to compare means of groups which differed from one another along two dimensions. A two-way ANOVA provided information needed in this study by answering these questions: (1) Is there a significant main effect for the first variable? (2) Is there a significant main effect for the second variable? (3) Is there a significant interaction between the two variables?

The use of a two-way ANOVA has two advantages that would not be provided by using a one-way ANOVA or the use of separate t tests. The advantages are: (1) It protects

against type one error, and (2) a two-way ANOVA can be used to identify the existence of a significant interaction between the independent variables which is not possible using a one-way ANOVA.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter is a presentation of a statistical analysis of the survey data to indicate to what degree, if any, the hypotheses are found to be supported within recognized limitations.

The study was designed to examine practicing secondary principals' perceptions of importance of identified tasks and the perceived amount of expertise to manage each given task. The variables of experience as a secondary principal and the secondary enrollment of the school were examined to determine the effect of these variables on the expectations of the principals' perceptions concerning importance and expertise required to manage identified tasks.

The returned questionnaires were grouped and data were tabulated in each of the three enrollment categories. The results of this grouping and tabulation are reported in Table 1.

A further grouping based on the total number of years of experience as a secondary principal was conducted. The results of this grouping and tabulation are reported in Table 2.

Table 1

Three Enrollment Categories and the Number of Principals in each Category who Returned the Questionnaire

Enrollment Categories	Number of Questionnaires Mailed	Number of Questionnaires Returned	Percent of Returns
0-200	137	115	83.94
201-400	51	46	90.19
401 or more	44	39	88.63
Totals	232	200	86.20

Table 2

Three Categories of Years of Experience as a Secondary Principal and the Number of Principals that are Represented by each Category

Years of Experience	Number of Principals
1-8	98
9-12	39
13 or more	63
Total	200

A two-factor analysis of variance was conducted for each task to test each of the four null hypotheses. The region of rejection was established by placing the level of significance at .05. A further test was conducted to

determine which of the group means were significantly different from the other means if the F value obtained using the two-factor analysis of variance was significant at the .05 level. The test utilized was the Fisher Least Significant Difference t Test.

Two tables were developed for each of the thirty-one identified tasks. The first set of tables reported is concerned with the importance of the identified task as perceived by secondary school principals using their experience and the enrollment of the secondary school as variables. The second set of tables reported is concerned with the secondary school principals' perceptions of the expertise required to manage each of the identified tasks using their experience and the enrollment of the secondary school as variables.

The first set of tables listed as Table 3 through Table 41 present the test results for the following null hypotheses.

1. There are no differences among the means concerning the perceived importance of each administrative task of secondary principals of varying administrative experience.

2. There are no differences among the means concerning the perceived importance of each administrative task of secondary principals of schools of differing size categories.

The summary tables incorporated in reporting the results of the two-factor analysis of variance have five columns: source or source of variation, df or degrees of freedom, SS or sum of the squares, MS or the mean square, and F or the value that is compared with the critical values in the F table. The summary tables have five rows: the first row shows the main effect of the first factor, the second row shows the main effect of the second factor, the third row indicates the interaction between the two factors, the fourth row indicates the within-group data or error, and the fifth row indicates the total.

Table 3 shows that the importance of the task of student scheduling did not vary significantly among secondary principals of schools of varying size and with different degrees of experience.

Table 3

Importance of Student Scheduling by Secondary School
Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary
School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.866	.433	1.130
Experience	2	.030	.015	.040
Interaction	4	3.057	.764	.097
Error	191	73.134	.383	
Total	199	77.120		

Not significant at the .05 level.

As shown in Table 4, the importance of supervision of Federal programs was not influenced significantly by secondary enrollment or years of experience of the principal.

Table 4

Importance of Supervision of Federal Programs by
Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of
Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	2.287	1.144	1.868
Experience	2	1.039	.519	.848
Interaction	4	.716	.179	.293
Error	191	116.939	.612	
Total	199	121.195		

Not significant at .05 level.

The statistical material presented in Table 5 reveals that neither the years of experience as a secondary principal nor the size of the secondary enrollment seemed to influence significantly the principals' perceptions relative to importance of time management.

The principals' perceptions of the importance of the supervision of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities did not appear to be influenced by school enrollment or the years of experience as a principal, as shown in

Table 6.

Table 5

Importance of Time Management by Secondary School
Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary
School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	2.903	1.451	2.856
Experience	2	0.720	.360	.709
Interaction	4	1.004	.251	.740
Error	191	97.068	.508	
Total	199	102.080		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 6

Importance of Supervision of Co-Curricular and Extra-
Curricular Activities of Secondary School
Enrollment and Experience of Iowa
Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.327	.664	1.450
Experience	2	.491	.245	.536
Interaction	4	3.138	.785	1.715
Error	191	87.396	.458	
Total	199	92.755		

Not significant at .05 level.

Table 7 indicates that neither the years of experience of secondary principals nor the size of the enrollment influenced significantly the principals' perceptions of the importance for planning for co-curricular and extra-curricular activities.

Table 7

Importance of Planning for Co-Curricular and Extra-Curricular Activities by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.261	.131	.273
Experience	2	1.078	.539	1.126
Interaction	4	1.734	.434	.906
Error	191	91.425	.479	
Total	199	94.875		

Not significant at .05 level.

The importance of handling grievances as perceived by secondary principals was not influenced significantly by either school enrollments or years of experience, as noted in Table 8.

As shown in Table 9, secondary principals of schools varying in enrollment did show significant differences in their perceptions of the importance of the delegation of responsibility to staff.

Table 8

Importance of Handling of Grievances by Secondary School
Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School
Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.062	.031	.047
Experience	2	.263	.131	.200
Interaction	4	4.657	1.164	1.768
Error	189	124.454	.658	
Total	197	129.495		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 9

Importance of Delegation of Responsibility to Staff by
Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa
Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	3.212	1.606	3.670*
Experience	2	.768	.384	.877
Interaction	4	.240	.060	.137
Error	189	82.709	.438	
Total	197	87.480		

*Significant at .05 level.

The data found in Table 10 reveals that principals of schools of varying enrollment differed as to the importance of delegation of responsibility. The table illustrates that principals in schools with 201 or more students viewed delegation of responsibility as more important than did principals of smaller schools.

Table 10

Importance of Delegation of Responsibility to Staff by
Secondary School Enrollment Categories using a
Multiple Range Test:Least Square Difference
Procedure

	0-200	201-400	401-
0-200		.2869*	.2602*
201-400			-.0267
401-			

*Significant at the .05 level.

Neither the school enrollment size nor the years of experience influenced significantly the perceptions of secondary principals toward the supervision of special education programs as noted in Table 11.

Principals' perceptions of the importance of formal evaluation of personnel were not influenced significantly by secondary school enrollment or years of experience as shown in Table 12.

Table 11

Importance of Supervision of Special Education Programs
by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa
Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.067	.533	1.150
Experience	2	.231	.116	.249
Interaction	4	.827	.207	.446
Error	189	87.648	.464	
Total	197	89.980		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 12

Importance of Formal Evaluation of Personnel by Secondary
School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary
School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.293	.146	.416
Experience	2	.966	.483	1.373
Interaction	4	1.934	.483	1.374
Error	188	66.169	.352	
Total	196	69.259		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 13 reveals that principals' perceptions of the importance of standardized test interpretation in schools were not influenced significantly by secondary school size or their years of experience.

Table 13

Importance of Standardized Test Interpretation by
Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of
Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.258	.129	.280
Experience	2	.526	.263	.570
Interaction	4	1.762	.441	.955
Error	188	86.687	.461	
Total	196	89.117		

Not significant at the .05 level.

The size of the schools and the years of experience of the principals did not influence significantly their perceptions of the importance of managing non-certified personnel. The results of this test are shown in Table 14.

Neither size of secondary enrollment nor their years of experience influenced significantly the principals' perceptions of student control and maintenance of discipline as noted in Table 15.

Table 14

Importance of Management of Non-Certified Personnel by
Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa
Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.464	.732	1.448
Experience	2	.607	.303	.600
Interaction	4	2.621	.655	1.296
Error	191	96.596	.506	
Total	199	100.955		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 15

Importance of Student Control and Maintenance of Discipline
by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa
Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.438	.219	.736
Experience	2	.438	.219	.736
Interaction	4	2.203	.551	1.852
Error	191	56.824	.298	
Total	199	59.995		

Not significant at the .05 level.

As shown in Table 16, secondary principals of schools varying in enrollment did show significant differences in their perceptions of the importance of conducting educational research.

Table 16

Importance of Conducting Educational Research by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	4.878	2.439	3.661*
Experience	2	1.546	.773	1.161
Interaction	4	.574	.144	.215
Error	190	126.565	.666	
Total	198	134.553		

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 17 shows that principals from schools with student enrollment of 401 or greater viewed the conducting of educational research as more important than principals of schools of smaller student enrollments.

Principals' perceptions of the importance of curriculum development were not influenced significantly by secondary school enrollment or years of experience. This is shown in Table 18.

Table 17

Importance of Conducting Educational Research by Secondary School Enrollment Categories using a Multiple Range Test: Least Square Difference Procedure

	0-200	201-400	401-
0-200		-.0826	.4048*
201-400			.4874*
401-			

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 18

Importance of Curriculum Development by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.463	.731	1.891
Experience	2	1.156	.578	1.493
Interaction	4	1.540	.385	.995
Error	190	73.507	.387	
Total	198	77.467		

Not significant at the .05 level.

As shown in Table 19, secondary principals of varying experience did show significant differences in their perceptions of the importance of knowledge of students' rights.

Table 19

Importance of Knowledge of Students' Rights by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.183	.091	.206
Experience	2	3.408	1.704	3.841*
Interaction	4	.721	.180	.406
Error	190	84.302	.444	
Total	198	88.834		

*Significant at the .05 level.

According to Table 20, secondary principals with the least experience (1 through 8 years) viewed the knowledge of students' rights as more important than did secondary principals with the most experience (13 or more years) as a principal.

Table 20

Importance of Knowledge of Students' Rights by Years of Experience as a Principal using a Multiple Range Test: Least Square Difference Procedure

	1-8	9-12	13-
1-8		-.1151	-.297*
9-12			-.1819
13-			

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 21 reveals that principals' perceptions of the importance of developing and implementing teacher inservice programs were not influenced significantly by secondary enrollment or their years of experience.

Table 21

Importance of Developing and Implementing Teacher Inservice Programs by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	2.008	1.004	2.700
Experience	2	1.253	.626	1.685
Interaction	4	.829	.207	.557
Error	190	70.636	.372	
Total	198	74.392		

Not significant at the .05 level.

As shown in Table 22, the importance of a working knowledge of legal aspects of education was not influenced significantly by secondary enrollment or years of experience.

Neither secondary enrollment nor years of experience of the principal appeared to influence significantly the principals' perceptions of the importance of the task of long-range planning of programs, as noted in Table 23.

Table 22

Importance of Working Knowledge of Legal Aspects of
Education by Secondary Enrollment and Experience
of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.279	.139	.330
Experience	2	.222	.111	.262
Interaction	4	.015	.004	.009
Error	190	80.326	.423	
Total	198	80.764		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 23

Importance of Long Range Planning of Programs by Secondary
Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School
Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.597	.798	1.749
Experience	2	.083	.042	.091
Interaction	4	2.347	.587	1.285
Error	190	86.737	.457	
Total	198	90.854		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 24 reveals that principals' perceptions of the importance of public relations were not influenced significantly by secondary enrollment or their years of experience.

Table 24

Importance of Public Relations by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.096	.048	.111
Experience	2	.460	.230	.531
Interaction	4	2.677	.669	1.547
Error	190	82.224	.433	
Total	198	85.598		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 25 illustrates that principals did not vary significantly in their perceptions of the importance of maintaining good staff morale in schools of varying size or differing years of experience.

As shown in Table 26, secondary principals of schools varying in enrollment did show significant differences in their perceptions of the importance of planning and conducting faculty meetings.

Table 25

Importance of Maintaining Good Staff Morale by Secondary
Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School
Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.050	.025	.068
Experience	2	.213	.107	.286
Interaction	4	.782	.195	.525
Error	190	70.740	.372	
Total	198	71.769		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 26

Importance of Planning and Conducting Faculty Meetings by
Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary
School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	2.866	1.433	3.995*
Experience	2	.480	.240	.670
Interaction	4	.303	.076	.211
Error	190	68.156	.359	
Total	198	71.819		

*Significant at .05 level.

As illustrated in Table 27, secondary school principals in schools with enrollments of 201 through 400 students perceived the importance of planning and conducting faculty meetings as more important than did principals with the smallest and largest school enrollments.

Table 27

Importance of Planning and Conducting Faculty Meetings
by Secondary School Enrollment Categories using a
Multiple Range Test:Least Square Difference
Procedure

	0-200	201-400	401-
0-200		.2478*	-.1195
201-400			-.3673*
401-			

*Significant at the .05 level.

Neither secondary enrollment nor years of experience influenced significantly the principals' perceptions of the importance of orientation of new staff members, as shown in Table 28.

Principals' perceptions of the importance of promotion of professional growth of teachers were not influenced significantly by years of experience or secondary enrollment size.

Table 28

Importance of Orientation of New Staff Members by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.189	.595	1.286
Experience	2	1.588	.794	1.718
Interaction	4	1.611	.403	.871
Error	190	87.821	.462	
Total	198	92.683		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 29

Importance of Promotion of Professional Growth of Teachers by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.264	.632	1.224
Experience	2	2.269	1.135	2.197
Interaction	4	3.678	.919	1.780
Error	190	98.133	.516	
Total	198	104.844		

Not significant at the .05 level.

The principals' perceptions of the importance of the task of maintaining effective communications with students were not influenced significantly by secondary enrollment or years of experience as shown in Table 30.

Table 30

Importance of Maintaining Effective Communications with Students by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.841	.420	1.105
Experience	2	1.394	.697	1.833
Interaction	4	.893	.223	.587
Error	190	72.266	.380	
Total	198	75.749		

Not significant at the .05 level.

The experience of principals did influence significantly their perceptions of the importance of keeping the superintendent informed, as shown in Table 31.

Secondary school principals with 13 years or more experience perceived the task of keeping the superintendent informed as more important than did principals with 9 to 12 years of experience, as shown in Table 32.

Table 31

Importance of Keeping the Superintendent Informed by
Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa
Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.529	.764	1.779
Experience	2	2.892	1.446	3.366*
Interaction	4	.425	.106	.248
Error	190	81.637	.430	
Total	198	86.221		

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 32

Importance of Keeping the Superintendent Informed by
Experience Categories using a Multiple Range Test:
Least Square Difference Procedure

	1-8	9-12	13-
1-8		-.2238	.0986
9-12			.3224*
13-			

*Significant at the .05 level.

Neither secondary enrollment nor years of experience of the principal influenced significantly the principals' perceptions of the importance of input into teacher

selection and assignment as revealed in Table 33.

Table 33

Importance of Input into Teacher Selection and Assignment
by Secondary Enrollment and Experience of Iowa
Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.255	.628	1.695
Experience	2	.300	.150	.405
Interaction	4	1.646	.411	1.111
Error	191	70.743	.370	
Total	199	74.000		

Not significant at the .05 level.

As shown in Table 34, the importance of the task of representing the school in associations as perceived by secondary principals was not influenced significantly by secondary school enrollment or years of experience.

Neither secondary school enrollment nor years of experience of the secondary principal seemed to influence significantly the principals' perceptions of the importance of working with advisory committees as revealed in Table 35.

As shown in Table 36, the importance of plant management as perceived by secondary principals was influenced significantly by both secondary enrollment and years of experience.

Table 34

Importance of Representing the School in Associations
by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of
Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.201	.101	.167
Experience	2	.610	.305	.505
Interaction	4	.649	.162	.268
Error	191	115.396	.604	
Total	199	116.875		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 35

Importance of Working with Advisory Committees by Secondary
School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary
School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.503	.252	.541
Experience	2	.335	.167	.360
Interaction	4	1.168	.292	.627
Error	191	88.885	.465	
Total	199	91.180		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 36

Importance of Plant Management by Secondary School
Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary
School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	4.225	2.112	3.971*
Experience	2	4.495	2.248	4.225*
Interaction	4	4.083	1.021	1.919
Error	191	101.601	.532	
Total	199	113.920		

*Significant at the .05 level.

As illustrated in Table 37, principals with one through eight years and thirteen or more years of experience as a secondary principal perceived the importance of plant management as more important than principals with nine through twelve years of experience.

Table 37

Importance of Plant Management by Experience Categories
using a Multiple Range Test:Least Square Difference
Procedure

	1-8	9-12	13-
1-8		-.3587*	-.0034
9-12			.3553*
13-			

*Significant at the .05 level.

As illustrated in Table 38, principals of schools with enrollments of 201 to 400 perceived plant management as more important than did principals of schools with enrollments of less than 200 students.

Table 38

Importance of Plant Management by Secondary School Enrollment Categories using a Multiple Range Test:
Least Square Difference Procedure

	0-200	201-400	401-
0-200		.3261*	.1817
201-400			-.1444
401-			

*Significant at the .05 level.

As shown in Table 39, secondary school enrollment influenced the perceptions of principals significantly toward the importance of the distribution of allocated funds.

Table 40 indicates that secondary school principals in schools with enrollments of 201 students or greater perceived the distribution of allocated funds as more important than principals of schools with less than 200 students.

Table 39

Importance of Distribution of Allocated Funds by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	9.254	4.627	7.375*
Experience	2	2.668	1.334	2.126
Interaction	4	2.238	.560	.892
Error	191	119.830	.627	
Total	199	132.875		

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 40

Importance of the Distribution of Allocated Funds by Secondary Enrollment Categories using a Multiple Range Test:Least Square Difference Procedure

	0-200	201-400	401-
0-200		.4304*	.3779*
201-400			-.0525
401-			

*Significant at the .05 level.

The perceptions among principals of the importance of the development of building policies for students and staff did not appear to be influenced significantly by

secondary school enrollment or the principal's years of experience, as shown in Table 41.

Table 41

Importance of the Development of Building Policies for Students and Staff by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.672	.336	.861
Experience	2	.373	.187	.478
Interaction	4	1.523	.381	.976
Error	191	74.533	.390	
Total	199	77.280		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Tables 42 through 76 present ANOVA results for the null hypotheses:

1) There are no differences among the means concerning the perceived expertise required to manage each administrative task of secondary school principals of varying administrative experience.

2) There are no differences among the means concerning the perceived expertise required to manage each administrative task of secondary principals of schools of differing size categories.

Expertise to manage the task of student scheduling

as perceived by principals did not appear to be influenced significantly by years of experience or secondary school enrollment, as shown in Table 42.

Table 42

Expertise Required to Manage Student Scheduling by
Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of
Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.691	.345	.807
Experience	2	.088	.044	.103
Interaction	4	3.029	.757	1.769
Error	191	81.725	.428	
Total	199	85.580		

Not significant at the .05 level.

As shown in Table 43 the principals' perceptions of the expertise required to manage the supervision of Federal programs was not influenced significantly by secondary school enrollment or years of experience.

Table 44 shows there was no significant difference among principals' perceptions concerning the expertise required for time management based on secondary enrollment or years of experience.

Table 43

Expertise Required to Manage the Supervision of Federal
Programs by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience
of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	3.745	1.873	2.519
Experience	2	.525	.263	.353
Interaction	4	1.671	.418	.562
Error	191	142.001	.743	
Total	199	148.620		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 44

Expertise Required for the Management of Time Management
by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of
Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	2.967	1.483	2.447
Experience	2	1.361	.680	1.122
Interaction	4	.142	.035	.059
Error	191	115.768	.606	
Total	199	120.320		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Secondary school enrollment and years of experience did not influence significantly the perceptions of principals toward the expertise required to manage the supervision of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities, as indicated in Table 45.

Table 45

Expertise Required for the Management of Supervision of
Co-Curricular and Extra-Curricular Activities by
Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of
Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.688	.344	.546
Experience	2	.411	.205	.326
Interaction	4	.043	.011	.017
Error	191	120.357	.630	
Total	199	121.580		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Neither secondary school enrollment nor years of experience influenced significantly the expertise required to manage the planning for co-curricular and extra-curricular activities, as revealed in Table 46.

Principals' perceptions of the expertise required to manage the handling of grievances, as shown in Table 47, were not influenced significantly by their years of experience or the secondary enrollment. A significant interaction

was indicated.

Table 46

Expertise Required for the Management of Planning for Co-Curricular and Extra-Curricular Activities by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.953	.476	.940
Experience	2	.230	.115	.227
Interaction	4	1.089	.272	.537
Error	191	96.796	.507	
Total	199	99.180		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 47

Expertise Required for the Management of the Handling of Grievances by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.633	.816	1.496
Experience	2	.668	.334	.612
Interaction	4	11.203	2.801	5.131*
Error	189	103.177	.546	
Total	197	116.955		

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 48 shows that the principals' perceptions of the expertise required to manage the task of delegation of responsibility to staff was not influenced significantly by secondary school enrollment or the principals' years of experience.

Table 48

Expertise Required for the Delegation of Responsibility
to Staff by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience
of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	2.183	1.092	1.927
Experience	2	.044	.022	.039
Interaction	4	1.427	.357	.642
Error	189	107.056	.566	
Total	197	110.773		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Neither secondary school enrollment nor years of experience influenced significantly the perceptions of the principals of the expertise required to manage the supervision of special education programs, as shown in Table 49.

Principals' perceptions of the expertise required to manage formal evaluation of personnel, as shown in Table 50, were influenced significantly by the secondary school enrollment.

Table 49

Expertise Required for the Supervision of Special Education
Programs by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of
Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.069	.034	.069
Experience	2	1.388	.694	1.404
Interaction	4	.123	.031	.062
Error	188	92.915	.494	
Total	196	94.589		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 50

Expertise Required for the Formal Evaluation of Personnel
by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa
Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	2.517	1.259	3.419*
Experience	2	.462	.231	.627
Interaction	4	.569	.142	.386
Error	188	69.211	.368	
Total	196	72.924		

*Significant at the .05 level.

As shown in Table 51, principals in schools with enrollments of 201 through 400 perceived the expertise required to manage the formal evaluation of personnel as more important than did principals of schools with enrollments of less than 200 students.

Table 51

Expertise Required for the Formal Evaluation of Personnel
by Secondary School Enrollment Categories using a
Multiple Range Test:Least Square Difference
Procedure

	0-200	201-400	401-
0-200		.2937*	.1005
201-400			-.1932
401-			

*Significant at the .05 level.

Principals' perceptions of the expertise required to manage the task of standardized test interpretation, as shown in Table 52, were not influenced significantly by their years of experience or the secondary enrollment. A significant interaction was indicated.

Table 53 shows that secondary school enrollment and years of experience did not influence significantly the perceptions of the principals of the expertise required for the management of non-certified personnel.

Table 52

Expertise Required for Standardized Test Interpretation by
Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa
Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.103	.552	1.064
Experience	2	.571	.285	.550
Interaction	4	5.229	1.307	2.521*
Error	188	97.505	.519	
Total	196	104.122		

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 53

Expertise Required for the Management of Non-Certified
Personnel by Secondary School Enrollment and
Experience of Iowa Secondary School
Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.531	.765	1.294
Experience	2	.167	.084	.141
Interaction	4	.707	.177	.299
Error	191	112.957	.591	
Total	199	115.520		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Neither secondary school enrollment nor years of experience influenced significantly the principals' perceptions of the expertise required to manage student control and the maintenance of discipline, as revealed in Table 54.

Table 54

Expertise Required for Student Control and Maintenance of Discipline by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	2.180	1.090	2.577
Experience	2	2.265	1.133	2.678
Interaction	4	1.152	.288	.681
Error	191	80.797	.423	
Total	199	87.020		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Principals' perceptions of the expertise required to manage the conducting of educational research was not influenced significantly by secondary school enrollment and their years of experience, as shown in Table 55.

Table 56 indicates that the perceptions of principals of the expertise required to manage curriculum development were not influenced significantly by secondary school enrollment or years of experience.

Table 55

Expertise Required for the Conducting of Educational
Research by Secondary School Enrollment and
Experience of Iowa Secondary School
Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.721	.860	1.167
Experience	2	.128	.064	.087
Interaction	4	4.295	1.074	.217
Error	190	140.108	.737	
Total	198	146.271		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 56

Expertise Required for Curriculum Development by Secondary
School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School
Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.533	.767	1.800
Experience	2	.044	.022	.052
Interaction	4	1.005	.251	.590
Error	190	80.896	.426	
Total	198	83.538		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Neither years of experience nor secondary school enrollment appeared to influence significantly how principals perceived the expertise required to manage the task of knowledge of students rights, as shown in Table 57.

Table 57

Expertise Required for Knowledge of Student Rights by
Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa
Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.264	.132	.309
Experience	2	.776	.388	.909
Interaction	4	3.588	.897	2.099
Error	190	81.172	.427	
Total	198	85.688		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 58 shows that the perceptions of the principals of the expertise required to manage the development and implementing of teacher inservice programs were not influenced significantly by secondary school enrollment or years of experience.

The principals' perceptions of the expertise required to manage the task of a working knowledge of legal aspects of education did not appear to be influenced significantly by secondary enrollment or years of experience, as shown in Table 59.

Table 58

Expertise Required for Development and Implementing of
Teacher Inservice Programs by Secondary School
Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary
School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.625	.313	.738
Experience	2	.716	.358	.845
Interaction	4	3.475	.869	2.051
Error	190	80.491	.424	
Total	198	85.186		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 59

Expertise Required for Working Knowledge of Legal Aspects
of Education by Secondary School Enrollment and
Experience of Iowa Secondary School
Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.701	.850	1.878
Experience	2	.261	.130	.288
Interaction	4	.767	.192	.423
Error	190	86.025	.453	
Total	198	88.734		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Neither years of experience nor secondary school enrollment appeared to influence significantly how principals perceived the expertise required to manage long-range planning for programs, as shown in Table 60.

Table 60

Expertise Required for Long-Range Planning of Programs by
Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa
Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.597	.798	1.749
Experience	2	.083	.042	.091
Interaction	4	2.347	.587	1.285
Error	190	86.737	.457	
Total	198	90.854		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 61 indicates that the principals' perceptions of the expertise required to manage the task of public relations were not influenced significantly by secondary school enrollment or years of experience. A significant interaction was indicated in this ANOVA test.

Table 62 shows that secondary school enrollment and years of experience did not influence significantly the principals' perceptions of the expertise required to manage the task of maintaining good staff morale.

Table 61

Expertise Required for Public Relations by Secondary School
Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School
Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.712	.356	.680
Experience	2	.017	.009	.016
Interaction	4	7.117	1.779	3.398*
Error	190	99.498	.524	
Total	198	107.357		

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 62

Expertise Required for Maintaining Good Staff Morale by
Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa
Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	1.083	.542	1.039
Experience	2	.745	.372	.714
Interaction	4	3.104	.776	1.489
Error	190	99.046	.521	
Total	198	104.211		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Principals' perceptions of the expertise required to manage the task of planning and conducting faculty meetings were influenced significantly by secondary school enrollment, as shown in Table 63.

Table 63

Expertise Required for Planning and Conducting Faculty Meetings by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	2.872	1.436	3.227*
Experience	2	1.542	.771	1.732
Interaction	4	1.665	.416	.935
Error	190	84.569	.445	
Total	198	91.497		

*Significant at the .05 level.

As illustrated in Table 64, principals of schools with enrollments of 201 through 400 perceived the expertise required for the planning and conducting of faculty meetings as more important than did principals of schools having less than 200 and greater than 401 students.

Principals were not influenced significantly in their perceptions of the expertise required to manage the task of orientation of new staff members by secondary school enrollment or years of experience, as indicated in Table 65.

Table 64

Expertise Required for the Planning and Conducting of
Faculty Meetings by Secondary School Enrollment
Categories using a Multiple Range Test:
Least Square Difference Procedure

	0-200	201-400	401-
0-200		.3348*	.0365
201-400			-.2983*
401-			

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 65

Expertise Required for Orientation of New Staff Members by
Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa
Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.846	.423	.898
Experience	2	2.346	1.173	2.492
Interaction	4	.976	.244	.518
Error	190	89.461	.471	
Total	198	94.392		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Neither secondary school enrollment nor years of experience influenced significantly the principals' perceptions of the expertise required to manage the task of promotion of professional growth of teachers, as revealed in Table 66.

Table 66

Expertise Required for Promotion of Professional Growth of Teachers by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.705	.352	.609
Experience	2	.679	.340	.588
Interaction	4	4.367	1.092	1.888
Error	190	109.853	.578	
Total	198	115.930		

Not significant at the .05 level.

The expertise required to manage the task of maintaining effective communications with students as perceived by principals were not influenced significantly by secondary school enrollment or by years of experience, as shown in Table 67.

Principals were not influenced significantly in their perceptions of the expertise required to manage the task of keeping the superintendent informed by secondary school

enrollment or years of experience, as indicated in Table 68.

Table 67

Expertise Required for Maintaining Effective Communications
with Students by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience
of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	2.016	1.008	1.793
Experience	2	.161	.081	.143
Interaction	4	1.831	.458	.814
Error	190	106.793	.562	
Total	198	110.935		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 68

Expertise Required for Keeping the Superintendent Informed
by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of
Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.153	.076	.107
Experience	2	.574	.287	.402
Interaction	4	2.812	.703	.986
Error	191	136.225	.713	
Total	199	139.955		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 69 shows that principals were not influenced significantly by years of experience or the secondary school enrollment in how they perceived the expertise required to manage the task of input into teacher selection.

Table 69

Expertise Required for Input into Teacher Selection and Assignment by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	2.402	1.201	2.813
Experience	2	.147	.074	.173
Interaction	4	1.809	.452	1.060
Error	191	81.496	.427	
Total	199	85.920		

Not significant at the .05 level.

As shown in Table 70, the principals' perceptions of the expertise required to manage the task of representing the school in associations were not influenced significantly by secondary school enrollment or years of experience.

Table 71 shows there were no significant differences among principals concerning the amount of expertise required to manage the task of working with advisory committees in relation to secondary school enrollment or their years of experience.

Table 70

Expertise Required for Representing the School in
Associations by Secondary School Enrollment and
Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.309	.154	.229
Experience	2	3.201	1.601	2.373
Interaction	4	3.430	.858	1.272
Error	191	128.808	.674	
Total	199	135.755		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 71

Expertise Required for Working with Advisory Committees by
Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa
Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	2.264	1.132	2.003
Experience	2	1.777	.889	1.573
Interaction	4	3.063	.766	1.355
Error	191	107.919	.565	
Total	199	116.000		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 72 indicates that the perceptions of principals were influenced significantly by years of experience in regard to the expertise needed to manage the task of plant management.

Table 72

Expertise Required for Plant Management by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.980	.490	.929
Experience	2	3.345	1.672	3.171*
Interaction	4	.458	.114	.217
Error	191	100.741	.527	
Total	199	106.000		

*Significant at the .05 level.

As shown in Table 73, principals with 13 or more years of experience as a principal perceived a need for greater expertise than did principals with 9 to 12 years experience when dealing with plant management.

Table 74 indicates that the perceptions of principals were influenced significantly by the size of the secondary school enrollment in regard to the expertise needed to manage the task of distribution of allocated funds.

Table 73

Expertise Required for Plant Management by Years of
Experience Categories using a Multiple Range Test:
Least Square Difference Procedure

	1-8	9-12	13-
1-8		-.2211	.1757
9-12			.3968*
13-			

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 74

Expertise Required for Distribution of Allocated Funds by
Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa
Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	6.194	3.097	4.558*
Experience	2	.957	.479	.704
Interaction	4	6.473	1.618	2.382
Error	191	129.771	.679	
Total	199	143.020		

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 75 illustrates that principals with student enrollment of 201 to 400 perceived the expertise required for the distribution of allocated funds as more important

than did principals in schools of enrollments of less than 200.

Table 75

Expertise Required for the Distribution of Allocated Funds
by Enrollment Categories using Multiple Range Test:
Least Square Difference Procedure

	0-200	201-400	401-
0-200		.4174*	.1744
201-400			.243
401-			

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 76 indicates that the perceptions of principals were not influenced significantly by secondary enrollment or by years of experience as to the amount of expertise required to manage the task of the development of building policies.

Table 77 is a ranking of the perceptions of the importance of each of the thirty-one tasks by the averaged means of the two hundred secondary principals who participated in this study. The rankings are listed from one which was most important to four which was of least importance.

Table 78 is a ranking of the perceptions of the expertise required to manage each of the thirty-one tasks by the averaged means of the two hundred secondary principals

who participated in this study. The rankings are listed from one which required the most expertise to manage the task to four which required the least expertise to manage the task.

Table 76

Expertise Required for Development of Building Policies for Students and Staff by Secondary School Enrollment and Experience of Iowa Secondary School Principals

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Enrollment	2	.265	.133	.348
Experience	2	1.275	.638	1.674
Interaction	4	1.691	.423	1.110
Error	191	72.768	.381	
Total	199	76.195		

Not significant at the .05 level.

Tables 77 and 78 show some similarity between the principals' perceptions of the importance of a task and the amount of expertise that is required to manage the task. This similarity can be noted in the first eight tasks listed. With very little variation in rank, the tasks are the same in each group.

The tasks ranked of high importance in both tables which required a high degree of expertise are areas of specialized skills necessary to work with teachers and

Table 77

Ranks of Thirty-one Tasks According to the Importance
of each Task as Perceived by 200 Iowa Secondary
School Principals

Task	Ranking by Averaging of the 200 Means
1. Formal evaluation of personnel	1.236
2. Student control and maintenance of discipline	1.255
3. Input into teacher selection and assignment	1.300
4. Maintaining good staff morale	1.327
5. Student scheduling	1.380
6. Development of building policies for students and staff	1.440
7. Curriculum development	1.470
8. Maintaining effective communications with students	1.503
9. Public relations	1.530
10. Knowledge of student rights (due process, search and seizure, etc.)	1.565*
11. Delegation of responsibility to staff	1.605*
12. Keeping the superintendent informed	1.635*
13. Time management (discriminate in identifying importance of projects, problems and issues)	1.640
14. Working knowledge of legal aspects of education (court decisions, D.P.I. rulings, teacher dismissal, etc.)	1.660
15. Orientation of new staff members	1.690
16. Long-range planning of programs	1.715

Table 77 (continued)

Task	Ranking by Averaging of the 200 Means
17. Developing and implementing teacher inservice programs	1.940
18. Handling of grievances	1.955
19. Supervision of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities	1.965
20. Planning and conducting faculty meetings	1.975*
21. Distribution of allocated funds	1.976*
22. Plant management	2.020*
23. Planning for co-curricular and extra- curricular activities	2.025
24. Supervision of special education programs	2.101
25. Promotion of professional growth of teachers	2.176
26. Representing the school in associations (athletic, principals' association, etc.)	2.225
27. Management of non-certified personnel	2.265
28. Working with advisory committees	2.290
29. Standardized test interpretation	2.392
30. Time management (discriminate in identifying importance of projects, problems and issues)	2.655
31. Conducting educational research	2.794*

*Indicates tasks with a significant variable at the .05 level of significance.

Table 78

Ranks of Thirty-one Tasks According to the Expertise
Required to Complete each Task as Perceived by 200
Iowa Secondary School Principals

Task	Ranking by Averaging of the 200 Means
1. Formal evaluation of personnel	1.296*
2. Student control and maintenance of discipline	1.430
3. Curriculum development	1.465
4. Input into teacher selection and assignment	1.480
5. Knowledge of students' rights (due process, search and seizure, etc.)	1.515
6. Maintaining good staff morale	1.588
7. Development of building policies for students and staff	1.595
8. Student scheduling	1.610
9. Working knowledge of legal aspects of education (court decisions, D.P.I. rulings, teacher dismissal, etc.)	1.623
10. Handling of grievances	1.685**
11. Maintaining effective communications with students	1.754
12. Delegation of responsibility to staff	1.770
13. Time management (discriminate in identifying importance of projects, problems and issues)	1.780
14. Public relations	1.805**
15. Long-range planning of programs	1.835
16. Developing and implementing teacher inservice programs	1.900

Table 78 (continued)

Task	Ranking by Averaging of the 200 Means
17. Orientation of new staff members	1.945
18. Supervision of special education programs	1.949
19. Planning and conducting faculty meetings	2.055*
20. Distribution of allocated funds	2.070*
21. Plant management	2.100*
22. Standardized test interpretation	2.156**
23. Planning for co-curricular and extra-curricular activities	2.210
24. Conducting educational research	2.221
25. Keeping the superintendent informed	2.235
26. Promotion of professional growth of teachers	2.256
27. Working with advisory committees	2.300
28. Management of non-certified personnel	2.320
29. Supervision of federal programs	2.370
30. Supervision of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities	2.390
31. Representing the school in associations (athletic, principals' association, etc.)	2.465

*Indicates tasks with a significant variable at the .05 level of significance.

**Indicates tasks with a significant interaction of variables at the .05 level of significance.

students.

The tasks ranked the lowest importance in both tables and which require the least expertise to manage appear to be those in areas of supervision and areas of planning or long-range goals.

Chapter 4 has been a presentation of the statistical results obtained from the gathered data. In Chapter 5, findings of the study, conclusions and recommendations are presented.

Chapter 5

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to obtain perceptions of practicing principals of the importance of thirty-one identified tasks and their perceived amount of expertise needed to manage each given task. The variables of size of secondary school enrollment and years of experience as a principal were introduced to determine if these variables significantly influenced the perceptions of principals.

Procedures

The instrument utilized in this study was a questionnaire which was validated and then sent to 232 of Iowa's secondary school principals. From a stratified population, a random group was established to serve as a sample. The principals were asked to indicate their perceived importance of the thirty-one identified tasks and indicate the amount of expertise they perceived was necessary to manage each of the tasks.

A two-factor analysis of variance was conducted to test the outcomes related to the hypotheses. In those instances where a significant F value was observed a least

significant difference t-test was utilized to determine pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level. Additional analysis of the data was conducted and presented in two tables which give the mean rank order of the importance of each task and the expertise required to manage each of the tasks as perceived by the 200 principals who participated in this study.

The three groups of secondary school enrollment and the three groups of years of experience as a secondary principal as designated for this study will be referred to in this chapter in the following manner for the purpose of reporting the results of the study.

Enrollment size:

Small - 32-200 students

Medium - 201-400 students

Large - above 401 students

Years of experience as a principal:

Least experience - 1-8 years

Moderate experience - 9-12 years

Most experience - 13 through highest years

Findings

The following hypothesis was tested using a two-factor analysis of variance:

There are no differences among the means concerning the perceived importance of each administrative task of secondary principals of schools of differing size categories.

Results of the Fisher least square difference procedure indicated that pairs of groups that were significantly different at the .05 level occurred within the following tasks:

1. The importance of delegation of responsibility to staff (Table 10). Principals of schools with medium or large student enrollment perceived delegation of responsibility to staff as more important than did principals of smaller schools.

2. The importance of conducting educational research (Table 17). Principals of secondary schools with large student enrollment perceived the conducting of educational research as more important than principals of secondary schools with medium or small student enrollment.

3. The importance of planning and conducting faculty meetings (Table 27). Principals in secondary schools with medium student enrollment perceived the importance of planning and conducting faculty meetings as more important than secondary principals with large and small student enrollment.

4. The importance of plant management (Table 38). Principals in secondary schools with medium student enrollment perceived plant management as more important than principals of secondary schools with small student enrollment.

5. The importance of the distribution of allocated funds (Table 40). Principals of secondary schools with

medium or large student enrollment perceived the distribution of allocated funds as more important than did secondary principals in schools of small student enrollment.

The following hypothesis was tested using a two-factor analysis of variance:

There are no differences among the means concerning the perceived importance of each administrative task of secondary principals of varying administrative experience.

As in the above, the Fisher least square difference procedure was applied where significance did occur in the analysis of variance. The procedure indicated significance did occur within the following tasks:

1. The importance of knowledge of student rights (Table 20). Secondary principals with the least experience perceived the knowledge of students' rights as more important than did secondary principals with the most experience.

2. The importance of keeping the superintendent informed (Table 32). Secondary school principals with the most years of experience perceived the task of keeping the superintendent informed as more important than did principals with moderate years of experience.

3. The importance of plant management (Table 38). Secondary principals of schools with medium student enrollment perceived plant management as more important than did secondary principals of schools with small student enrollment.

As in the preceding, the following hypothesis was tested using a two-factor analysis of variance:

There are no differences among the means concerning the perceived expertise required to manage each administrative task of secondary principals of schools of differing size categories.

The Fisher least square difference procedure was applied where significance did occur in the analysis of variance. The procedure indicated significance did occur within the following tasks:

1. The expertise required for the formal evaluation of personnel (Table 51). Principals of schools with medium student enrollment perceived the expertise required to manage the formal evaluation of personnel as more important than did principals of schools with small student enrollment.

2. The expertise required for the planning and conducting of faculty meetings (Table 64). Principals of secondary schools with medium student enrollment perceived the expertise required for the planning and conducting of faculty meetings as more important than did principals of schools of large and small student enrollment.

3. The expertise required for the distribution of allocated funds (Table 75). Secondary principals with medium student enrollment perceived the expertise required for the distribution of allocated funds as more important than did secondary principals in schools with small student enrollment.

As in the preceding, the following hypothesis was tested using a two-factor analysis of variance:

There are no differences among the means concerning the perceived expertise required to manage each administrative task of secondary school principals of varying administrative experience.

The Fisher least square difference procedure was applied where significance did occur in the analysis of variance. The procedure indicated significance did occur within the following tasks:

1. The expertise required for plant management (Table 73). Secondary principals with the most years of experience perceived a need for more expertise in managing the school plant than did secondary principals with moderate years of experience.

Additional findings in regard to the data tested were:

1. A significant interaction between the variables of enrollment and years of experience occurred in tasks dealing with the expertise required to manage a given task. The specific tasks where significant interaction was observed were: handling of grievances, standardized test interpretation, and public relations.

2. Tables 77 and 78 show a correlation using the Spearman Rank Order Coefficient resulting in a Rho of .74. The five highest ranked tasks in order of importance were: formal evaluation of personnel, student control and the maintenance of discipline, input into teacher selection and

assignment, maintaining good staff morale, and student scheduling. The five lowest ranked tasks in order of importance were listed as follows: management of non-certified personnel, working with advisory committees, standardized test interpretation, time management, and the conducting of educational research. The five tasks requiring the most expertise to manage were listed as: formal evaluation of personnel, student control and maintenance of discipline, curriculum development, input into teacher selection and assignment, and knowledge of students rights. The five tasks requiring the least expertise to manage were: working with advisory committees, management of non-certified personnel, supervision of federal programs, supervision of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities, and representing the school in associations.

Conclusions

Some significant relationships were found to exist as reported in the findings of the study. However, given the limited number of significant results, no one of the major research hypotheses can be conclusively rejected. Even so, a number of conclusions may be drawn from the study.

1. Differences in the size of secondary schools had no major effect on the importance Iowa principals placed on specific administrative tasks.
2. Differences in the size of secondary schools had

no major effect on Iowa secondary school principals' perceptions of the expertise required to manage specific administrative tasks.

3. Differences in years of experience of Iowa secondary school principals had no major effect on their perceptions of the expertise required to manage specific administrative tasks.

4. Differences in years of experience of Iowa secondary school principals had no major effect on the importance they place on specific administrative tasks.

5. Significant interaction of school size and years of experience was evident only in tasks which dealt with perceptions of the degree of expertise required to manage an identified task.

6. The ranking of the identified tasks indicated that secondary principals found areas of specialized skills necessary to work with teachers and students as more important than tasks requiring supervision or planning educational outcomes.

On the basis of the conclusions drawn from the data presented in this study, the following recommendations seem appropriate.

Recommendations

1. As a rule, institutes of higher education or agencies responsible for inservice programs have not

considered school enrollment size or years of experience as a principal as factors in their training programs. Based on the findings of this research, it is recommended that institutes of higher education and agencies responsible for inservice programs should not consider school size or years of experience as a principal as factors in the development of their programs for Iowa principals.

2. As a rule, institutes of higher education or agencies responsible for inservice programs have not established course content or inservice content that is based on practicing principals' perceptions of important tasks. In light of the findings of this research project, it is recommended that institutes of higher education and agencies responsible for inservice programs should implement and develop programs for principals that reflect tasks that are perceived by principals as being tasks of high importance and require a high degree of expertise in specialized skills necessary to work with teachers and students.

3. The existence of significant interaction occurring in the analysis of certain tasks involving the expertise required to manage these tasks is an area that should be further explored. Based on the findings of this study, significant interaction occurred in the handling of grievances, standardized test interpretation, and public relations. It is recommended that further study and research in these areas be conducted which is beyond the scope

of this study.

4. This study should be replicated periodically as emerging social and cultural trends may necessitate a reidentification of tasks that are associated with the secondary principalship.

As a rule, institutes of higher education or agencies responsible for inservice programs have not addressed to any great extent the area of expertise that is required to manage tasks associated with the secondary principalship. Based on the findings of this study, a high degree of expertise is required in areas that require specialized skills necessary to work with teachers and students. It is recommended that institutes of higher education and agencies responsible for inservice programs should take into consideration the area of expertise required to manage tasks associated with the principalship when they develop and implement programs for instruction of secondary principals.

The implications of this study on the direction that should be taken in future programs for the instruction of principals indicates that greater emphasis should be placed on the skills necessary to work with students and teachers.

The study indicates that when developing instructional programs for secondary principals, institutes of higher education should take into account that secondary principals' views, with very few exceptions, the importance and expertise required of the tasks they perform are the

same regardless of the size of the school they administer and the number of years that they have been a principal. In the relatively few areas that were found to be influenced by school size or years of experience as an administrator, extra care should be exercised in the development of the curriculum to cope effectively with the differences in perceptions that were encountered.

It is hoped that the implications of this research study will be explored and utilized by institutes of higher education and inservice agencies to better meet the needs of secondary principals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Blumberg, Arthur, and William Greenfield. The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.
- Burlingame, Martin, Fred D. Combs, Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Paul W. Thurston. Educational Governance and Administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1980.
- Burrupe, Percy E. Modern High School Administration. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.
- Byrne, David R., Susan A. Hines and Lloyd E. McCleary. The Senior High School Principalship, the National Survey. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978.
- Campbell, Ronald F., and Russel T. Gregg. Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- Culver, Carmen M., and Gary J. Hoban, eds. The Power to Change Issues for the Innovative Educator. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1973.
- Cunningham, Lavern, Walter G. Hack and Ralph O. Nystrand, eds. Educational Administration, the Developing Decades. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977.
- Drake, Thelbert L., and William H. Roe. The Principalship. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1980.
- Edmonson, J. B., Joseph Roemer, and Francis Bacon. The Administration of the Modern Secondary School. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953.
- Epps, Edgar G. Cultural Pluralism. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974.
- Epstein, Benjamin. Principals: An Organized Force for Leadership. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1974.

- Gorton, Richard A. Conflict, Controversy and Crisis in School Administration and Supervision: Issues, Cases and Concepts for the 70's. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company Publishers, 1972.
- Hagman, Harlan L. The Administration of American Public Schools. York, Pennsylvania: The Maple Press Company, 1951.
- Jacobson, Paul B., James D. Logsdon, and William C. Reavis. The Effective School Principal. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Jones, James, Jackson C. Salisbury and Ralph L. Spencer. Secondary School Administration. New York: McGraw Hill Company, 1969.
- Kamm, Richard M., Fredrick M. Raubinger and Merle R. Sumption. Leadership in the Secondary School. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company, 1974.
- Kellams, Darrell. The Role of Principals Today Tracing its Development. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979.
- Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1975.
- Kraft, Leonard E. The Secondary School Principal in Action. New York: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1971.
- McCleary, Lloyd E., and Scott D. Thomson. The Senior High School Principalship, Vol. III. The Summary Report. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979.
- Oliva, Peter F. The Secondary School Today. New York: Intext Educational Publishers, 1972.
- Ovard, Glen F. Administration of the Changing Secondary School. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.
- Weldy, Gilbert R. Principals What They Do and Who They Are. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979.
- Williams, Stanley W. Educational Administration and Secondary Schools: Task and Challenge. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Yeager, William A. Home-School-Community Relations. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1939.

Periodicals

Grant, Ed A., and Kenneth E. McIntyre. "Performance Review: How Principals, Teachers, and Superintendents View the Principalship." The National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, LXIV (February, 1980), 44-49.

Killian, Michael G., and Michael J. Sexton. "Climbing the Ladder to Leadership." The National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, LXIII (March, 1979), 9-14.

Krajewski, Robert J. "Texas Principals Implications for Perceived Roles." The National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, LXI (December, 1977), 16-20

Landers, T., and Robert S. Silverman. "It's the Principal of the Thing." The National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, LVIII (September, 1974), 45-47.

Olds, Robert. "The Principal's PR Role." The National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, LVIII (January, 1974), 17-21.

Parsons, John M. "PPBS How it Affects the Role of the Principal." The National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, LVI (October, 1972), 60-65.

Pierson, Stephen L. "Democratic Administration--Another View." The National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, LXII (January, 1978), 21-24.

Vetter, Eric W. "Role Pressure and the School Principal." The National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, LX (November, 1976), 11-23.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PROPOSED QUESTIONNAIRE

<u>COLUMN I: Task Area</u>	<u>COLUMN II Importance of Task</u>				<u>COLUMN III Degree of Expertise Required</u>			
1. Student Scheduling	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
2. Supervision of Federal Programs	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
3. Time Management (discriminate in identifying importance of projects, problems and issues)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
4. Supervision of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
5. Planning for co-curricular and extra-curricular activities	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
6. Handling of grievances	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
7. Delegation of responsibility to staff	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
8. Supervision of special education programs	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
9. Formal evaluation of personnel	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
10. Standardized test interpretation	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
11. Management of non-certified personnel	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
12. Student control and maintenance of discipline	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
13. Conducting educational research	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

COLUMN I: Task Area	COLUMN II Importance of Task	COLUMN III Degree of Expertise Required
14. Curriculum development	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
15. Knowledge of student rights (due process search and seizure, etc.)	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
16. Development and implementing teacher inservice programs	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
17. Working knowledge of legal aspects of education (court decisions, D.P.I. rulings, teacher dismissal, etc.)	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
18. Long range planning of programs	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
19. Public relations	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
20. Maintaining good staff morale	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
21. Planning and conducting faculty meetings	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
22. Orientation of new staff members	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
23. Promotion of professional growth of teachers	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
24. Maintaining effective com- munications with students	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
25. Keeping the superintendent informed	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
26. Input into teacher selection and assignment	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
27. Representing the school in associations (athletic, principals' associations, etc.)	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
28. Working with advisory committees	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

<u>COLUMN I: Task Area</u>	<u>COLUMN II Importance of Task</u>	<u>COLUMN III Degree of Expertise Required</u>
29. Plant management	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
30. Distribution of allocated funds	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
31. Development of building policies for students and staff	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

APPENDIX B

LETTER ACCOMPANYING PROPOSED QUESTIONNAIRE

December 1, 1980

Dear

In partial completion of a doctoral program at Drake University, I'm conducting a study which involves the use of a questionnaire that lists important tasks associated with the principalship. This list was compiled by: (1) conducting a review of literature, (2) frequent correspondence with principals, and (3) attendance at meetings, conventions, inservices, school board meetings, etc., over the past ten years.

I'm at the point in the study that I need to validate the enclosed questionnaire by obtaining input from past and present principals as to whether the tasks listed are the important tasks of principals in the state of Iowa. I realize that this list is not inclusive of all tasks associated with the principalship. As you well know, if it were inclusive, the list could evolve into a small book as each school district added to the list its schools' demands on the principal. It is intended that the tasks listed are an accurate representation of tasks commonly associated with the principalship.

Attached to the questionnaire is a worksheet that I trust you will use if you have comments to make. I have included a self-addressed stamped envelope for you to return the worksheet.

I wish to thank you in advance for your time and consideration in the evaluation of the questionnaire. I hope that someday I may be of aid to you in one of your educational endeavors.

Respectfully,

A. L. Adair,
Past Principal and current
Graduate Assistant
Drake University

APPENDIX C

WORKSHEET ACCOMPANYING PROPOSED QUESTIONNAIRE

Please check appropriate response. If response is yes, please be specific and list needed changes below each category listed.

- I. Are there areas that need clarification? Yes _____ No _____
- II. Is too much emphasis placed in any area? Yes _____ No _____
- III. Do you have any suggested additions? Yes _____ No _____
- IV. Do you have any suggested deletions? Yes _____ No _____

Additional Comments:

Do you want an abstract of the dissertation when it is completed?

Yes _____ No _____

APPENDIX D

COVER LETTER

January 6, 1980

Dear Principal:

I am requesting your assistance in completing the enclosed questionnaire which is part of a doctoral study on the determining of graduate course content and inservice needs. It is through the identification of task importance and expertise needed to manage tasks that a determination can be made concerning graduate course content and inservice needs of secondary school principals in the state of Iowa.

Attached to the questionnaire is a cover sheet containing needed information and instructions for the completion of the questionnaire. As noted, please respond to the identified areas as you perceive them in your school and distribute your responses across all levels of importance and expertise.

It is hoped that this research project will result in information that can be used to meet the educational needs of principals in the state of Iowa. If you would like a copy of the abstract of the completed dissertation, please indicate by placing a check in the space provided at the bottom of the second page of the questionnaire. I have included a self-addressed stamped envelope for you to return the cover sheet and the completed questionnaire.

I wish to thank you in advance for your time and consideration in the completion of the questionnaire and cover sheet. I hope that someday I may be of aid to you in one of your educational endeavors.

Respectfully,

A. L. Adair,
Past Principal and Current
Graduate Assistant
Drake University

APPENDIX E

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Needed Information: Please answer the following three questions:

1. Total number of years as a principal? _____
2. Number of years in present position as principal?

3. Number of principalships since first becoming a principal? _____

Directions for Completion of the Questionnaire

1. Column I - the identified task areas are listed.
2. Column II - Circle the number representing the importance of the identified task in your school as you perceive its importance using the following scale.

#1 - Major Importance

#2 - Important

#3 - Minor Importance

#4 - Little Importance
3. Column III - Circle the number representing the expertise required to manage the identified task as you perceive it in your school using the following scale.

#1 - High degree of expertise requiring detailed knowledge of all aspects of the task.

#2 - Medium degree of expertise requiring some knowledge of all aspects of the task.

#3 - Low degree of expertise requiring little knowledge of all aspects of the task.

#4 - No particular expertise required to manage the task.

Note: Please distribute your responses across all levels of importance and expertise using the preceding directions.

QUESTIONNAIRE

COLUMN I: Task Area	COLUMN II Importance of Task				COLUMN III Degree of Expertise Required			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1. Student scheduling	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
2. Supervision of Federal programs	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
3. Time management (discriminate in identifying importance of projects, problems and issues)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
4. Supervision of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
5. Planning for co-curricular and extra-curricular activities	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
6. Handling of grievances	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
7. Delegation of responsibility to staff	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
8. Supervision of special education programs	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
9. Formal evaluation of personnel	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
10. Standardized test interpretation	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
11. Management of non-certified personnel	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
12. Student control and maintenance of discipline	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
13. Conducting educational research	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
14. Curriculum development	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
15. Knowledge of student rights (due process, search and seizure, etc.)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

<u>COLUMN I: Task Area</u>	<u>COLUMN II</u> <u>Importance</u> <u>of Task</u>				<u>COLUMN III</u> <u>Degree of</u> <u>Expertise</u> <u>Required</u>			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
16. Development and implementing teacher inservice programs	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
17. Working knowledge of legal aspects of education (court decisions, D.P.I. rulings, teacher dismissal, etc.)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
18. Long range planning of programs	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
19. Public relations	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
20. Maintaining good staff morale	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
21. Planning and conducting faculty meetings	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
22. Orientation of new staff members	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
23. Promotion of professional growth of teachers	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
24. Maintaining effective communications with students	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
25. Keeping the superintendent informed	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
26. Input into teacher selection and assignment	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
27. Representing the school in associations (athletic, principals' associations, etc.)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
28. Working with advisory committees	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
29. Plant management	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
30. Distribution of allocated funds	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
31. Development of building policies for students and staff	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

I would like a copy of the abstract of the dissertation.